

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Monday, May 15, 1972 – Friday, June 9, 1972

Fine Binding

No. 61



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, May 15, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto



CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have many visitors with us today. In the Speaker's gallery and in the east gallery we have the Ingersoll Women's Progressive Conservative Association. We also have in the Speaker's gallery a Rotarians' group study exchange between Branch 314 Bombay, India, and Branch 368 Michigan and Kent county.

In the east gallery there are students from Gordon McGregor Public School of Windsor; and in the west gallery students from St. Isaac Jogues Separate School of Don Mills and the Adult Day School of Dundas St. W., Toronto.

As well, we will be favoured at 3 o'clock with students from the Northlea Public School of Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

POSITION OF DENTURISTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, two questions for the Minister of Health; one following from the speech made by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Parrott) to the dentists over the weekend. Would he agree that the member for Oxford made it clear that the government does not entirely agree with his stated views on denturists at the present time; and secondly, is the government contemplating changes in legislation at this session so this matter can be settled?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it is truthful to say that the government does or doesn't agree with statements of the hon. member for Oxford, because we haven't discussed it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, maybe the minister could tell us.

Hon. Mr. Potter: One thing I do know is that I have seen a copy of the hon. member for Oxford's speech. I think, as members will all agree, I am the last man in this world that would ever suggest any member not get up and say what he thinks.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is the only way we move.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I do want to say, though, that the member for Oxford, in the speech that he made, said that he was in favour of the principle; but he wasn't in favour of licensing people holus-bolus and felt that they should be properly trained and properly licensed to perform many functions, and not only the paramedical or paradental group. And I agree with this wholeheartedly.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary of Justice): Sure!

Hon. Mr. Potter: As the member knows, the government at the present time is exploring this whole field of paramedical personnel and paradental personnel. I am very hopeful that within a matter of one or two weeks I'll be back in the Legislature with the answer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Does the answer mean legislation, or just a statement of policy?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, I am preparing, as the member knows, Mr. Speaker, a bill to cover all of the health disciplines; and I am hopeful that this can be settled and be incorporated in that bill, which will be brought into the House within two or three weeks.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Very good.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, since that apparently is the minister's intention, can he prevent any further public raids on denturists' offices in the interim? Can he request the Attorney General or the Minister of Justice, the Social Development minister—I forget; the title has escaped me; but whatever his post is—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Provincial Secretary for Justice.

Mr. Lewis: Provincial Secretary for Justice; can he request that the raids cease?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, when it gets back to that, Mr. Speaker, really, I don't like the raids; but on the other hand, they shouldn't be operating. They are operating illegally, and I don't think they should be. I think they should bring the matter to our attention, which they have done. But there is no reason why the so-called denturists, or anybody else in this province, should be allowed to break the laws. If the laws are wrong, then we should consider changing them. And that is what I would like to see done.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the minister give us any indication as to the government's plans for a dental care programme—at least for children—as suggested by the hon. member in his speech?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, will the minister not consider at least alleviating the strictures of the punishment and enforcement provisions until such time as the government makes its decision?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, if I had my way I would increase the fines that are levied, because the only reason this isn't working today is because the fines don't amount to a row of beans. I don't think anyone under any circumstances should be allowed to break the laws of the province, regardless of what they are.

Mr. Ferrier: The mining companies do.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am very anxious to get into this, and I'm getting into it. We are dealing with it right now and believe me as soon as we can get it settled we will.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, why does the minister in one breath say he does not like the raids and then in the other breath ask for increased penalties, when he knows he is bringing in legislation to change the situation?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I thought the Minister of Health might respond to that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Really, there is nothing to say.

MEDICARE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Minister of Health. Is he prepared to table today the information that he told the OMA he had available last Friday, which indicated that some of the doctors themselves were responsible for the unwarranted problems that we have been experiencing with the administration of our Medicare and the financing of the plan?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Some of this information has already been brought to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, by some of the hon. members. I was referring not only to the medical profession, I was referring to all involved in the health insurance programme.

At the present time, the information is turned over to the review committee that is studying all these matters that we decided several months ago were to be studied. If anything was to be gained by tabling it I'd be glad to do so. I don't think it serves any useful purpose at the present.

There is going to be much more information, incidentally. Since last week, as members are aware, teams of doctors have been going out through the province—unannounced, incidentally—into hospitals and reviewing the records of every patient who is in hospital. From this we will gather all kinds of information concerning patient care, proper use of facilities, whether or not the bed capacity of hospitals is sufficient or whether we have too many of one type of bed or another, what types of accommodation we need and so on. This will all be available and I'll be delighted to table it when I get it all. I don't want to bring it in piecemeal.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Wouldn't the minister agree that he indicated he was going to make it public on Friday if any of the doctors had asked for it? Wouldn't he further agree that innuendoes indicating that certain doctors may or may not be overcharging and be guilty of malpractice as far as their charging is concerned, should be backed up by public information rather than just sort of implications that may arise from planted questions and things like that?

A final question, Mr. Speaker: When is the minister going to give us a full report of the financial implications of our Medicare programme, which is now in its fourth year? Surely it's time we had some financial—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —some financial report?

Hon. Mr. Potter: As I have already intimated, Mr. Speaker, as soon as I have the information, ample information, I will be glad to table it. But I don't want to bring in information that is not complete. Certainly as the Act is now I can't specifically name physicians, but by the same token I'll be delighted to bring to the House, if it is the wish of the House, information on what we are dealing with at the present time, including the cases of abuse by the public as well as by all members in the professions that are handling these cases. A problem that we're faced with is that right now we are spending a lot of time in trying to determine how we can properly stop some of the abuses that go on with the system as it is operated today. The hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) has already told us the reason why the chiropractors, for instance, were able to abuse the programme because of the way the schedule is set up. These are the matters that are now being reviewed in order that we can stop these abuses; but by the same token, how we are going to prevent the public from abusing the programme is an entirely different story, and I'm approaching it from the standpoint of public relations. All of us are involved in this and if we all take the same approach and try to make the public aware of what happens when they abuse a programme and why the costs are skyrocketing, I think maybe we'll be successful.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A final supplementary on this—

Mr. Speaker: No, the supplementaries have been straying considerably from the original question. In any event, there have been a reasonable number of supplementaries.

Mr. Lewis: And the Health estimates are coming up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

PLEA BARGAINING IN ONTARIO COURTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Justice. Can he tell the House what direction has been given to the Crown attorneys dealing with plea bargaining? I've asked about this before, surely he can enlighten us as to the direction that has been given them.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I know what the intention of the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) is in respect of those directions. I'm not so sure that he has yet sent out the directions to the Crown attorneys, and until he does so I think the question should be directed to him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister tell us when the Attorney General may be back in the House?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If it's not today, it will be tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

HEALTH SERVICES INSURANCE

Mr. Lewis: A very simple question of the Minister of Health, if I may, Mr. Speaker, since his estimates, as I understand it, are to follow upon those of Natural Resources. Would he consider having a full statement ready for the House on the health services insurance plan, regarding costs, abuses, etc., as a prelude to the debate?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't have that at this time. I understand I'm going on this afternoon and there is no way I'd have that ready.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, you're going on this afternoon?

Mr. Renwick: Don't count on it.

Mr. Lewis: Well, don't count on it.

Mr. Renwick: The minister can work on it during dinner hour.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR MAJOR APPLIANCES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice?

The provincial secretary will recall the sad case in July 1971 of the children who were suffocated in a clothes dryer in Scarborough. At the time, if the minister will recall, he was going to try to introduce legislation or enter into an agreement—

Mr. Speaker: Can the hon. member inject an interrogation somewhere?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I'm trying to place a question with which the minister can deal

fully. Can he tell us what success he has had over almost the last year, in an effort to bring in legislation and regulations which hopefully would avoid tragedies like that of the two young children in the icebox in Alexandria yesterday.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes. At the time I said I would certainly take it up with the minister in the provincial government who would be responsible, if in fact the responsibility lay within our jurisdiction. I have since been assured that it does not lie within our jurisdiction, but nevertheless I've attempted privately to follow it up with the manufacturing association that has to do with those types of appliances, because it's not only dryers—it relates to freezers, refrigerators and so on. They inform me now that all of those types of appliances made in Canada for the last couple of years have had some sort of a freeing device or anti-locking device that can be opened from the inside.

The problem still exists, however, with appliances that are imported into Canada. Certainly there has been correspondence between this government and the federal government on this point, but as far as I know no import restrictions have been placed by the federal government on those types of appliances which do not contain this anti-locking device from the inside.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the minister will recall that he was considering legislation for the mandatory removal of all doors; has that been pursued with the federal government? Can it be done provincially?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I don't think it can be done provincially, and as far as I know it has not been pursued with the federal government. I think the difficulties of enforcement of a piece of legislation like that are rather unrealistic.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

DRUG SUBSTITUTION

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Health: When is it the minister's intention to bring in his legislation permitting the substitution of pharmaceutical products by druggists, as indicated in the report submitted months ago?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I'm trying to think of that one.

Mr. Lewis: The drug substitution problem.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Drug substitution? I don't know whether I'll be bringing in drug substitution legislation in this session or not. At the present time, we are in the process of studying all these reports, along with the other legislation. I haven't quite made up my mind whether to bring it in now or not.

BILL 77

Mr. Lewis: Yes, we will pursue it in estimates, too.

May I ask, Mr. Speaker, a question of the provincial Treasurer? Is it the provincial Treasurer's intention to allow Bill 77 and all its various amendments on the Municipal Act to go before committee?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, to standing committee!

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions?

Perhaps I might just take a moment at this time to inform the hon. members that we have a special guest with us who has arrived in the Speaker's gallery. Mr. Sidney Spivak, the Leader of the Official Opposition in the Province of Manitoba, is with us this afternoon.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Next Premier of that province!

Mr. Ferrier: He will be there a long time.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Until the next election!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

HOME IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A question of the provincial Treasurer: With reference to the $10-million job creation home improvement programme which the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) said wasn't being washed out but was going to be redirected through the municipalities, what has happened to that programme this winter? How many jobs have been created? How much of the $10 million has been spent?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Presumably, Mr. Speaker, all of it has been spent or is in the process of being spent. The original allocation, as I recall, for the provincial-municipal incentive programme was $25 million. It was

increased to $35 million and, as some of the members opposite would know, as on this side, the whole $35 million was allocated and, I believe, will be spent.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: As I understand this $10-million programme was separate from the others, or conceivably the government telescoped them. How exactly was it handled?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think we dealt with that at the fall session when, in fact, we voted $35 million—if that is the correct figure—instead of $25 million for the provincial-municipal incentive programme.

Mr. MacDonald: Can the provincial Treasurer give us a report on what proportion of moneys was given to what municipalities, or how many municipalities were involved?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would be glad to, yes. I think that is a question which could properly go on the notice paper, and I would be glad to provide that information.

I might say, also, that in terms of the programme which we had hoped to bring about last winter, and on which we found there simply wasn't time and that there were a number of difficulties associated with it in terms of a rehabilitation programme for individual homeowners, probably through the municipalities, one of the other reasons the money was diverted to the provincial-municipal incentive programme was that we are hopeful—and I think with some good reason as it turns out—that something along those lines may be contained in the amendments to the National Housing Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

JUDGE'S STATEMENT IN WINDSOR

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, Mr. Speaker.

Would the secretary investigate a situation of possible discrimination on the basis of nationality or racial background in a provincial court judge's statement in Windsor—Judge Stewart—who said in late April he would begin using jail sentences instead of the customary fines for Americans caught at the border with marijuana?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, I noticed those press reports and I assumed that the Attorney General also noticed those press reports. If he did not, I shall make sure now that they are brought to the Attorney General's attention for whatever action he may deem is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

DELAY IN COURT PROCEEDINGS

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

I ask the minister if he is aware that Ontario Supreme Court Justice Moorhouse appeared in Windsor courts and none of the legal profession was available to go forward, 30 in all. They had promised that the proceedings would go forward. Is he aware that when the justice was there none of the lawyers was available for courtroom work and the justice had to return to Toronto?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, because the hon. member was kind enough to send me over a press clipping about it, I am aware of that particular problem.

This, again, is something that falls more directly under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General. It will be another matter brought to his attention on his return.

I should say to the hon. members, though, that this is a recurring problem in the courts at the moment. I think it is almost the No. 1 problem of the day. Certainly, when I was Attorney General in a good percentage of the correspondence that reached me from citizens of this province who were annoyed at the handling of matters in the courts, invariably the question of delay was one of the main complaints.

They were ready to blame the law; they were ready to blame the courts; they were ready to blame the judges; they were ready to blame this government; they were ready to blame the members of the Legislature. Seven or eight times out of 10 when we investigated these individuals' complaints, invariably we could lay the reasons for the delay directly at the feet of the counsel involved.

In some cases, there were justifiably good excuses for not proceeding with the action, but the thing that I felt was most appalling was the lack of communication between the members of the legal profession and their clients and the public at large in this particular respect. Justice delayed is justice denied is an old maxim in the courts.

I don't know what the answer to the problem is, however. It may be that sometime we will have to come along with some type of compulsory, mandatory court list which will mean that whether or not people are ready to go on they have to go on. We cannot continue to waste the time of the courts and the time of the people in the courts and the whole court procedures by permitting some people to delay these things for their own purposes far more, sometimes, than their clients'.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Has the minister ever considered having a commission of people outside the legal profession investigate the operations of our courts in Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: As my friend knows, or at least I hope he knows, the Ontario Law Reform Commission, for about a year and a half, has been engaged in what I hope will be the major study of the administration of justice, certainly in the first half of this century in Ontario in any event. I think, until that study is completed, our hands are tied here in respect of some reforms in the court system.

I am hopeful that report will be forthcoming in the near future. At the time when that report is made, of course, we will have to judge whether or not the type of commission or body which my friend indicates would be worthwhile.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary: Does the Law Reform Commission not consist totally of the legal profession?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The Law Reform Commission itself does but they do retain and employ people outside the Law Reform Commission and people outside the legal profession in their studies.

Mr. Speaker: Any more supplementaries? The hon. member for Waterloo North is next.

OFFTRACK BETTING

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He should have stayed home!

Mr. Good: Either that or get his Attorney General here!

Could the minister inform the House as to his interpretation of the Criminal Code and how he intends to enforce it as it relates to the operation of Mr. Chapman who has acted as a one-man bookie or pool seller at local agricultural societies one-day race stands across the Province of Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I'm not competent to inform the hon. member of what he desires. I know about Mr. Chapman and the way in which he has carried on in the past and the acceptance of his services in that particular field. Mr. Chapman, I think, appeared before our task force on offtrack gambling or, if he himself didn't appear, others appeared on his behalf or there was a brief or some representation put in on his behalf before that task force. I know they are quite aware of what he has been doing and what he is doing. Hopefully when we come to the end of the line in respect of our policy determinations respecting offtrack betting there will be a place for Mr. Chapman in the overall picture.

Mr. Good: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that if he is not allowed to operate, it creates two serious problems—the fact of conflicting dates and the fact that the parimutuel setup which would be supplied by the federal Department of Agriculture is just too expensive for a one-day agricultural county fair to handle? They can't handle that.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What I had envisaged eventually would be some sort of a mobile trailer outfit, quite frankly, that could go around to the one-day fairs—perhaps more than one trailer—and I am certain that Mr. Chapman with his experience in the field would be utilized at that time.

Mr. Good: Would the minister judge whether it would be safe for him to operate this year or not?

An hon. member: The minister is not a judge.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I couldn't tell the member that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

DELAY IN EXHUMATION

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, Mr. Speaker. If the Provincial Secretary

for Justice believes that justice delayed is justice denied, can he explain the long delay in the absence from the government of a reply to Dr. Schreter, who has asked that the body of his son be exhumed to explain the discrepancy of the evidence given at the inquest with the autopsy report?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think that question should be directed to the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko).

Mr. Shulman: Is the provincial secretary not responsible for policy in the absence of the Solicitor General? Can he explain the policy of the long delay?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think the policy is well known. It is the working out of some of the details of the policy that I can shift to my colleague.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

NEW TORONTO AIRPORT

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs: When does the minister expect to lift the provincial freeze on the lands lying within the noise zone of the proposed new airport?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, we will be pleased to do that as soon as the precise location of the airport runways is determined by the government of Canada. As soon as that happens, then we will be able to define the noise zones and modify the zoning bylaws which have been put in force by the minister's signature. But until we know the precise location of the runways, that is impossible.

Mr. Deacon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister plan some form of compensation to those who suffer damage as a result of this freeze?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Deacon: Does he not feel they are suffering damage, and therefore they are entitled to some form of claim that the province might help them with, in dealing with the federal government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sure, yes; perhaps the federal government might consider this, but I think if the member thinks about what he has said, he will see how impractical his suggestion is.

Mr. Deacon: Supplementary: Since it is a provincial freeze in relation to a federal matter, will the minister undertake to intervene on behalf of those who do suffer damage and have claims for damage against the federal government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The federal government has indicated its responsibility in this area and I don't think it is necessary for me to intervene.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

STOCK EXCHANGE COMMISSION RATES

Mr. Renwick: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Will the minister indicate whether or not the Ontario Securities Commission, on its own initiative, has undertaken any kind of a study with respect to the question of fees to be charged by the Toronto Stock Exchange, and which will be the subject matter of the hearing which I understand commences tomorrow?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the hon. member that I have had that question before, perhaps in other terms; I don't have the answer but I will get it for him.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, would the minister consider requesting the securities commission to make certain it delays any decision by the commission until such time as the report commissioned from Urwick Currie & Partners Ltd by certain members of the Toronto Stock Exchange is available for consideration?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am not too sure, Mr. Speaker, that I would have that authority, but I will take the question under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

IMPLEMENTATION OF DAYCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services: Will the minister indicate when he is finally going to bring down the regulations to the Day Care Centres

Act to make operable those amendments that were brought into the Act almost a year ago now.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Those regulations, Mr. Speaker, have been approved and we have written to the various agencies to make them aware they have been approved.

Mr. R. S. Smith: In other words, as soon as the minister has had answers back from the various agencies, he will be instituting the regulations? How long does he expect that will be?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The regulations, Mr. Speaker, have been approved. They have been passed by order in council and will be Gazetted anytime now; we've written to the agencies to make them aware of this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: With reference to the lead editorial in the Farm and Country on May 9, dealing with the problem arising from municipal action in the Niagara Lake area from a bylaw forbidding farmers to expand pig, chicken and beef operations because of livestock aroma; has the minister intervened with his colleague to see what happened with the ministerial order or directions to certain farmers, who are, according to the editorial, the main reason for this whole problem? What reason is there, after the farmers have been warned, that there has been no follow-through by any government department to see that the clean-up is made?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't followed up on that. Possibly I should, but we were given to understand the contacts had been made by the appropriate departmental officials with the farmers to whom I referred in that letter as having been those who weren't really cleaning up the situation that needed cleaning up. I understand the matter is going before the Municipal Board before the bylaw is implemented.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the minister intercede with his colleague to see that he follows through?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I am not going to say that I will or I won't, Mr. Speaker. I certainly intend to discuss it with him. I read the editorial on the weekend myself, and I wasn't aware of the fact that more appropriate action hadn't been taken at that time. I'm not sure what action can be taken, quite frankly, but we will explore the possibilities.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

DISTRIBUTION OF CIRCULARS TO ONTARIO TEACHERS

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education. Can the minister advise me as to the number of copies printed and the cost for Canadian Curriculum Material, Circular 15, 1972; and secondly, will the minister agree with me that to send a copy of this booklet to every teacher in the province seemed an unnecessary waste of public funds?

Mr. Lewis: And an unnecessary repetition of the question.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Well, Mr. Speaker, I will answer the last part first, because I find that a very astounding statement to come from the hon. member. As a matter of fact, I had a meeting this morning with the group from the Committee for an Independent Canada and they thought that this was one of the really positive steps that had been taken over the last little while; sending out this material to every teacher in this province. Because if we are ever going to start making our children aware of the Canadian heritage and building up this respect and knowledge of Canada, it has got to start with the teachers.

We felt that book on Canadian Curriculum Material, which took a year to prepare, had to be in the hands of every teacher. So personally, regardless of the cost, I think that it was a very necessary step to have taken. Now, I will be happy to table for the hon. member the cost of it; but I certainly feel that every cent that was spent there was worthwhile if we really believe in trying to foster Canadian heritage in this country.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Has the minister looked into the regulations of his department as to whether or not individual classroom teachers have the right and power to spend money for these particular books without the approval of the school board and the principal of the school?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it matters whether they have the right to spend money or not. This is a—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well how are they going to buy the stuff if they can't spend the money?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wells: This is a cataloguing of material. I don't know whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition has read Circular 15 or not; it is a cataloguing of all the Canadian material that is available. All the books on history that are by Canadians and about Canadians; and all the other material that is there. Now a teacher may want to buy it, he may want to get some of the free material, he may want to borrow it, he may want to suggest to his school board they get it. But he has to know it is available; and he now knows it is available in that book.

Mr. Lewis: Send a complimentary copy to Herb Gray; he needs it!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

REPAIR SERVICE BUREAU

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Is the minister planning a bureau of repair services so that individuals who have various appliances and so forth repaired, including automobiles, could be assured that they are not being defrauded?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: This question is currently under consideration, but I can't announce any action that I might take at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

OTTAWA-CARLETON MUNICIPAL AMALGAMATION

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Lewis: He is the only member who pays the minister homage that way.

Mr. Deacon: Regarding the possible amalgamation of municipalities within the Ottawa-Carleton region, will the ratepayers in the affected municipalities be given the right to express their views on amalgamation by plebiscite before such amalgamation is undertaken?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I doubt that very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

PROVINCIAL ENUMERATION FOR ASSESSMENT PURPOSES

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Revenue regarding the provincial enumeration which was—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I never agreed with the plebiscite.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I see, the minister is keeping us—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Perhaps the hon. member would repeat his question; the chair could not hear it.

Mr. Burr: If the hon. Treasurer is finished? A question of the Minister of Revenue regarding the provincial enumeration which was discontinued some weeks ago, to be resumed in September. When it is resumed in September, will it start from the beginning or will it continue from where it left off?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know how long it took the hon. member to figure out that question, but hopefully it wasn't as long as it's going to take me to figure out the answer!

I think, because of the new Municipal Election Act, they probably will have to start from the beginning because there are different questions which have to be asked. That is subject to correction, Mr. Speaker. I will go back to my officials and ask them the direct question.

Mr. Ferrier: The government has wasted a lot of money in having to start all over again.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions? The hon. member for Port Arthur.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS IN THUNDER BAY

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): A question of the Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received a communication from Mayor Saul Laskin of Thunder Bay that I referred to last week in the question period?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Yes.

Mr. Foulds: Is he considering Mayor Laskin's letter favourably?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I have received the communication from Mayor Laskin and, I might say, a few other communications, not too many, along with press releases from Thunder Bay. Referring to Mayor Laskin's letter, we are considering his suggestions and I will be in touch with him.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions? The hon. member for Waterloo North.

USE OF ASSESSMENT COMPUTER TAPES

Mr. Good: A question of the Minister of Revenue—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Keep it dry!

Mr. Good: —Since the government has refused to supply the computer tapes regarding assessment data to separate school boards without charge, does the minister plan to charge the federal government when they want the computer tapes to ascertain values for capital gains tax purposes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am not too certain that we have agreed that the federal government is entitled to this. However, if they are entitled to it, I presume, if we are permitted to charge them for it, we will do that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We might make a profit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know whether we will make a profit.

Mr. Good: The minister said he was going to supply them with the tapes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I take it the hon. member got that from my colleague whose responsibility it was to deal with this previously. I will find out specifically whether we have made any arrangements with the federal government along these lines and, if we can, whether we shall charge them for it.

Mr. Good: A supplementary question: Was the decision to withhold the tapes from separate school boards made in the minister's department or by the provincial Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I believe there really was a financial problem here. The job was a tremendous job and it would be a tremendous task to provide this information to all those who feel they would like to have it. The information is available when it is necessary to have that information without spewing out all of this information across the province to all those who feel they would like to have it.

There are quite a few school boards, and to provide this information would be a tremendous task. I think the cost involved, having regard for the value of the information received, would be entirely out of proportion.

Mr. Speaker: Oral question. No further questions? The oral question period has expired.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

DEATH OF PRISONER IN HAMILTON JAIL

Mr. J. R. Smith: A question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice: Could the minister investigate the situation that developed in Hamilton last week when a young man took his life in the Hamilton jail? He was admitted on April 28 and took his life on May 4. In fact, he was a former patient of the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital. Obviously there is no cross-checking being done by the local magistrates with the psychiatric hospital as to discharged patients who require follow-up care.

Hon. Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, first of all, in the case of a death such as that, there certainly will be an inquest; and until the inquest is over I think it would be best to withhold any public comment.

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps the minister will bring it to the attention of the member for High Park?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Aren't the members on speaking terms over there?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Where is the member for High Park?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Aren't members opposite on speaking terms?

Mr. Lewis: Very harmonious!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Send him a memo!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, what do the members say to each other?

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ministry of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Schools Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, in introducing amendments to five Acts relating to education in this province, I would like to say first that many of the amendments are of a housekeeping nature and others are designed to bring our educational legislation into line with other recent legislation of the government, particularly the Municipal Elections Act and the Age of Majority Act.

In this last regard, I would draw the attention of the House to a new section in the Schools Administration Act which provides that any authority or obligation that devolves upon a parent in respect of a child, now devolves upon the pupil if he is over 18.

There are several other amendments to these Acts that are quite substantive, and I would draw the attention of the House to some of these.

Among the provisions in the Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Amendment Act is one that makes school board advisory vocational committees optional rather than mandatory. In recent years, boards have been required to appoint an advisory vocational committee with a set number of trustees, employers and employees. Under this amendment, a school board will be free to decide on its own to appoint an advisory committee to advise it on its vocational courses. The members of the committee, and the terms for which they would serve, will be left entirely up to the board.

Mr. Speaker, there are several provisions in the Schools Administration Amendment Act which are of real interest. There is a new section that provides greater safeguards to ensure the confidentiality of school records. It clearly establishes the right of students and parents to have access to these records, based on the principle that such information is the private property of the individual concerned.

School records will not be available to anyone else except school staff and supervisors, without the written permission of the student or parents.

Also, if students or parents dispute the information contained in these records, a clear procedure is laid down by which any inaccuracy may be corrected. This provision is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, to young people who wish or need to use their school records when applying for a job or for admission to college or university.

This Act contains new provisions designed to provide a real stimulus to the total community use of schools and other public facilities. School boards and municipal authorities will now be able to work out agreements to share costs in jointly planning, building and operating facilities for recreational, cultural, educational, administrative or other community purposes.

We believe this will result in a better use of school and community facilities, and bring the concept of the school as a focus for varied community activities closer to being a reality.

The Act will also make it possible for a school board to share facilities with another board for teaching or administrative purposes, to share the services of teachers and other personnel, and to share the cost of constructing new facilities required under such arrangements.

There is an amendment that allows school boards, with the approval of the minister, to make arrangements with developers or others relating to the provision of school facilities in multi-use buildings such as apartment buildings or shopping centres.

Among other provisions in this Act is one which clearly underlines a school principal's right to use volunteer assistants in his school.

There is a provision which will give, Mr. Speaker, many Indian citizens a better voice in the education of their children.

A school board which has an agreement to educate Indian children will now be required to appoint to the board the person named by the Indian bands concerned, provided the number of children involved exceeds certain minimum requirements.

At the present time, although a school board may appoint an Indian member, Mr. Speaker, it is under no compulsion to appoint the particular person named by an Indian band, or indeed to appoint any Indian representative at all.

Mr. Speaker, there are provisions in the Schools Administration Amendment Act designed to encourage natural science programmes and outdoor educational activities. All school boards in the province may now acquire land inside or outside their jurisdiction to operate such programmes. Also, two or more boards, under this amendment, may jointly buy land and build and operate facilities for a natural science programme or other out-of-classroom activity.

Or a board may make an agreement with a conservation or other appropriate authority to build facilities on property of the authority, and to conduct programmes in co-operation with the conservation authority.

Mr. Speaker, another section provides that a school board may pay all or part of the cost of group life insurance, Ontario health insurance and supplemental hospital and medical insurance for employees and their families, rather than the maximum of two-thirds that now exists. This brings school boards into line with municipal councils in this regard.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in the Public Schools Amendment Act, there is a provision to require that those municipalities which have trust funds derived from the Ontario Municipalities Fund or other sources except the collection of tax levies, will be required to apply the money in these funds in 1973 to reduce taxes that would otherwise be required for public school purposes.

RIDING HORSE ESTABLISHMENTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to regulate Riding Horse Establishments.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide licensing for the persons who operate riding horse establishments and to prescribe qualifications to be met by the applicant. It provides for an appeal for the refusal or the renewal of a licence; it provides for inspection of riding horse establishments and for regulations describing the facilities and the equipment required, the standard of care to be maintained and all matters related to the well-managed horse-riding establishment.

DEAD ANIMAL DISPOSAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Dead Animal Disposal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is simply to expand the licensing requirements to brokers in meat from dead animals.

LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT

Mr. Lawlor moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide a specific penalty for landlords who do not comply with the requirements as to posting up their legal name and address for service.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to speak on a matter of privilege.

On page 2139 of the Hansard "blacks" for Thursday, there is the statement by the member for Scarborough West that I planted a question asked by the member for St. David. To read it exactly:

> *Mr. Lewis*: That was the most preposterous question of any question period that Margaret Scrivener asked today.
>
> *Mr. R. G. Hodgson*: Did you plant that? Did you really plant that question?
>
> *Mr. Lewis*: Frank Drea planted that question, I am told.

Mr. Speaker, I had no knowledge of that question before it was asked. I was not consulted on it. My position regarding the two gentlemen—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Order, order!

Mr. Drea: —who were mentioned in that question is publicly known, and in a great many ways I have considerable sympathy with them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's a speech.

Mr. Drea: And I want it particularly put down on the record that I have no reason to doubt that they are other than honourable men, and I had nothing whatsoever to do with that question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What a relief!

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 26th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Mr. Chairman: The estimates of the Ministry of Health. Does the hon. minister—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Just before we begin, as I understood the adjournment on Friday, we were continuing with Natural Resources and then going into Health. Can I ask the House leader about that?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Chairman, as I think you may appreciate, I was called away from the House for public business and I regrettably could not be here for the closing of the House. However, I think it was well understood that if Natural Resources did not proceed, Health would, although I must admit to the hon. member I did not make that statement.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): We were misled.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister of Health have an opening statement?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I want to pursue this just for a moment, because although I assume we can get hold of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta), who was to do our leadoff, in time to do it, were we informed or was there a note or any indication this morning that the change would take place?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What was known was the sequence of estimates as they would arise in the House.

Mr. Lewis: I understood the sequence, yes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, in presenting the estimates of the Ministry of Health it is not my intention to make any lengthy statement at this time. I just wanted to make a few comments if I might.

I am sure the hon. members of the House are well aware of my feelings concerning the health programme for the province, and what I would like to see instituted. I think it is sufficient for me to say that it is my intention, at least for the time being, to promote the extension of community health centres—call them community health councils, or district health councils if you like—to try to get the research and implementation and administration of all the health needs of the community into local hands.

At the same time we want to institute, and we are instituting, new concepts in the mental health programme in the province. We are studying new methods of health delivery, and I am sure many members of the Legislature are aware of this because of the planning that is going on in their individual ridings, in which we have pilot projects of one nature or another to determine what is perhaps the best type of health programme for that area and what is the best type of health facility.

The members are also aware that we are experimenting with different types of health facilities; that we realize finally that active treatment hospitals aren't necessarily the best

form of treatment, that hospitalization is not always needed and it doesn't always best suit the needs of the patient to be in an active treatment bed. Certainly from the taxpayers' standpoint we have found that there are other methods of treatment which are just as effective or even more effective and much more economical. We are experimenting with different types of facilities such as self-care units, convalescent facilities, rehabilitative facilities, along with home-care programmes and nursing home care.

We are very concerned with the number of medical graduates that we are putting out from our medical schools. We appreciate there are two factors here. One is that we can no longer depend on foreign countries to educate our medical students where, in many cases, they are much more needed in their countries than they are here. Their need is greater than ours. On the other hand, we are depriving our own sons and daughters of the opportunity of obtaining a medical education and becoming graduated in this profession.

We realize that the demand for entrance into medical school is much greater than we can meet. There have been reports submitted on this. I'm sure most of the members of the Legislature are aware of the Mustard report, which has recommended that we take advantage of the vast reservoir of clinical material which is available in smaller hospitals throughout the province—something which I brought to the attention of this Legislature several years ago. We're now at the point of studying this method of increasing our medical graduates and we hope that within the very near future we will be able to supply, certainly the majority of the graduates we need, if not all of them.

In other words, I think it suffices for me to say, Mr. Chairman, that we continue to work toward developing a programme which is best suited to meet the health needs of the people of our province as economically as possible.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the remarks of the minister in opening his estimates. I think those of us on our side have viewed the minister's career with interest, both before he became the minister of this portfolio and in the few short, stormy months since.

Is that an eight ball that you're behind, Mr. Minister?

An hon. member: He carries it with him wherever he goes.

Mr. Paterson: It doesn't look like a crystal ball from here.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It's a little cloudy.

Mr. Paterson: There has been a lot of rapid changes in the thinking and the complexity of the total health care package or programme for our province, even in the past two or three weeks, when we first expected these estimates to be before the House.

I know in preparation for the estimates, I got involved in reading the reports of the Council on Health that were tabled some months and years ago. I believe one of the statements by the former minister (Mr. Wells) indicated the significance of the changes that were going to occur in the Seventies. Possibly I could read a short paragraph from this particular statement:

> Today, as we launch into the 1970s we are probably on the threshold of the most exciting decade in the history of health services in this province.

Possibly the word "exciting" might be changed to "costly" with what has gone on in the past three or four years, but we'll leave it as it was stated.

> Probably the most signifiant sign of the future is the recent emergence of the concept of health care, as opposed to medical care alone. Health care embraces everything necessary to maintain physical, mental and social well-being.

I think that I and my party and most of us in this House can agree with this particular concept as enunciated by the Council on Health.

There were a couple of programmes in their reports of the years 1966 to 1969 that were enunciated to them, which I would like to outline before proceeding with my own remarks.

First, in the future there's going to be a shift in emphasis from among the several levels of institutionally based care—that is, active treatment, convalescent, chronic hospitals and nursing homes—toward care in the community and on an ambulatory basis and through home care and other arrangements. Here again, I think this is a good philosophy that we on this side can agree with, to get away from the large institutions and get the people back in their home communities.

The second guideline of investigation by the group notes:

—the acute awareness of the council of the increasing cost of health services and the need for social and economic balance in the level of resources deployed against health care objectives.

I think this is possibly the area in which this department, possibly this government, this Legislature and, maybe, we can include the federal departments, have failed. Certainly, the costing factor must be paramount in the eyes of not only the minister and his officials, but of us in this Legislature and the people of our province and country.

I had one of my people break down the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures in regard to health care. I know that figures may possibly be boring, Mr. Chairman, but I would just like to enunciate a few of these to get in perspective where we in the Province of Ontario stand on health care in relation to the rest of the Dominion of Canada.

In 1970 the total expenditures for personal health care in our province were $1,742 million. This year we are seeing a budget of over $2 billion, which I believe is the largest expenditure by the province and it looks as though this is going to escalate in the months and years to come.

In 1970 the cost per capita was $227.69, which was the highest of any province in Canada. Our guestimates for this year are somewhere in the $250 area per person as compared to a Canadian average of roughly $205. Back in 1960 the expenditure on personal health care in the Province of Ontario was about $550 million, so if you can visualize it, Mr. Chairman, there was an increase in the past year of some 217 per cent in dollars expended in this area.

Of significance, of course, is the expenditure as it relates to personal income, and we have figured out that in 1960 the percentage of personal income expended on health care was about 4.73 per cent; in 1970 it was up to 6.37 per cent. We haven't figured it out for this current year but we assume it is going to be rather static or only slightly higher, about 6.5 per cent.

Expenditures per person on prescribed drugs in 1960 was $7.72; this went up to $15.92 in 1970, which was the second highest expenditure across the Dominion of Canada.

Similarly in dentists' services. In 1960 it was roughly $8.09; in 1970 it was $16.10.

Physicians' services had a tremendous increase. The figure rose from $23.18 average in 1960 up to $57.68 in 1970, which is the highest per person in the Dominion of Canada.

I think this underlines my thoughts that possibly we have failed in the area of costs and this is something that we must take cognizance of. I think this, Mr. Chairman, led to the dispute that was carried in the media a few short weeks ago between the federal Minister of Health, Mr. Munro, and the provincial minister.

There was a challenge issued by each minister, with the federal minister indicating that we in Canada can't afford to pay for the existing programmes unless we cut back in some of the unnecessary expenditures and duplications. This, of course, was countered by the provincial minister asking the federal people to get involved in these new programmes for training paramedical people, facilitating the flow of money from the federal officials.

I think there is an awakening on the horizon that costs must be met. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I, on behalf of my party this year, am not going to ask for the inclusion of any new medical services under the terms of the Act as we now know it, although we on this side, and I am sure others in this House, would like to see, if possible, the inclusion of dental care, or more dental care than we have now. We would also like to see the inclusion of the provision of drugs for certain groups in our population and other matters that relate to the total health care package of the people of our province.

We would like to see them but I for one cannot, in all honesty, ask for the inclusion of more until this whole matter of cost cutting and the settling out of the total expenses in this department can be straightened out and we see where we are actually going in the months and years to come.

I think we on this side were quite pleased, and at the time we did make our remarks to the effect that we were happy that OHSIP and Ontario Hospital coverage were being combined. I'd hoped that the minister could take the final step in the next few months and move into the area that has been our party's platform, in that we remove the premium business as such and place it on the tax base. I suggest this for two reasons specifically:

First, I think the anxiety about coverage that now exists across our province would be eliminated. I know there is a great deal of confusion at the present time with the combining of the two areas under one premium.

There are numerous, in fact there are hundreds or thousands of people today, who either don't have coverage or don't know that they do have coverage, especially those who are on subsidized premiums under health care. There seems to be a great mixup in this regard and it is coming to our attention in greater volumes each day.

The fact is that if this was put on the tax base and hopefully if there were the utilization of the social insurance number rather than the number that now exists under the old hospitalization number—which it has been indicated we're eventually going to get to—this confusion and concern and anxiety of people would be eliminated.

Secondly, I would hope from our estimates, there would be tremendous cost savings in the administration of health care. Possibly as a first step, as was indicated in the minister's opening remarks, or remarks in the question period today, we have got to look at the abuses of the programme. This is the only fallacy that I can see—that if everyone has a total health care package granted to him through the tax base, there could be the possibility of more abuses of the system. Hopefully, there could be a counter-balance in this regard.

I do believe that the savings in the administration of this would be tremendous, plus the fact that everyone in this province would have the entitlement to go to a doctor and receive health care without worrying about whether or not he was covered.

Mr. Chairman, in the auditor's report for 1970-1971 on page 32, there are two matters drawn to the attention of the members of the Legislature. Possibly the minister in his reply can indicate to me what is going to be done about these two matters. The first was in relation to the recovery of maintenance charges for hospital care, and I quote:

> With the inception of the hospital care insurance plan and its extension to patients in these hospitals, there has been a reduction in the amount of maintenance recovered, since only uninsured patients are liable for maintenance. Nevertheless the accounting functions and collection procedures continue to take up a significant amount of time and effort on the part of the business office staff.

And it goes on to give an example. I'll just give one here: March 31, 1971, the gross accounts receivable were $5,438,781 and the actual cash received was $311,167, which is substantially less than 10 per cent of the accounts receivable.

I'll give one specific example, Mr. Chairman, contained in the report dated June 28, 1971, on the audit of Northeastern Regional Mental Health Centre, Porcupine. This report indicated that from inception in 1968 to May 31, 1971, the hospital had billed some $243,962 to patients, but was only able to collect $1,338. I think this is a severe loss. In this case it is something that should be looked into. Some of us as members often intercede of behalf of constituents, particularly on behalf of local hospitals to try to get the hospitalization to pick up bills after some error or some negligence on the part of the individual and this of course is met. I hope the minister can comment on this particular situation.

Here again, I think this underlines our party's philosophy that if the health care cost is put on the tax base such an occurrence won't necessarily happen, because everyone will have that coverage and we won't have this type of situation.

The second item in the auditor's report was in relation to the substantial balances accumulated in the canteen surplus accounts and patients' pin money interest accounts. Apparently a current review indicated that balances totalling approximately $340,000 were on hand in these particular accounts, and basically this money is to be used for the benefit of the patients. I just wonder what policy changes are being contemplated by the department in relation to these two requests or suggestions by the Provincial Auditor in relation to these two matters.

In this past week we had the medical profession convention in Toronto, and I am sure that most of us are aware of the discussions that took place there through the reporting in the media. I for one am very pleased with the convention, in that the medical profession announced that there would be no increases across the board in the charges that they are going to make this year. I think this gives several months breathing time for the minister and his officials to consider our position, in that we feel that these matters should become a matter of negotiation between the government, or a governmental body, and the medical profession itself.

We feel, since basically we are paying the freight, that there must be negotiation and an agreement on the tariff schedule rather than allowing the medical profession as such to arbitrarily adopt increases when they feel,

justifiably or otherwise, that they are warranted. Basically, we feel that there should be a sounding board where they can justify their increased costs or other reasons for increasing the tariff for certain professional endeavours and I hope that this can be given consideration.

We are also concerned and feel that there should be audits. It was indicated by the minister today that there are going to be audits in the hospitals, but we feel that there should be audits going on in the medical offices and the offices of non-medical personnel, such as the podiatrists and others, due to the discussions that were in the media a few short weeks ago.

Several questions came up today in the question period, Mr. Chairman, in relation to the denturist dental situation. Personally, I for one feel that there is a place in society for—call them dental technicians at this point—if they are properly trained technicians and possibly have some special training in regard to working directly on the body or in the mouth of the patient, and we will await with interest the outcome of this particular matter.

I know that my colleague from Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) and I attempted to arrange to have the denturists' society present its brief to the standing commitee on human resources, which is concerned with this. We did have the privilege of meeting with the dental group and hearing their side on this particular matter and on other matters that are of concern to them, but we are still awaiting that first meeting with the denturists. In the meeting with the dental society, I wouldn't say it was enlightening but it was very heartening to myself to know that they were asking for more auxiliary people. I know I have spoken to personal acquaintances in the dental profession and I think they all agree that dental technicians working in their offices can undertake much of the basic normal routine work that the dental practitioner himself has to undertake, and they possibly can do an equally good if not a better job on cleaning teeth and sundry items such as this to free the more highly qualified man, the dentist himself, for the intricate work he must undertake.

I feel there is an onus on the Minister of Health in conjunction with his colleague, the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Kerr), to provide these courses for the denturists or whatever name is finally going to accrue to the dental technicians and so forth who are moving into this field.

I recall reading somewhere—I guess it was in the article in the Globe and Mail this morning—the comment that there are more people untreated by dentists than are treated. So there certainly is a crying need for an increase in the numbers in this profession in our province.

In relation to this same matter, which I think underscores the argument between Mr. Munro, the federal health minister, and our minister in regard to the matter of cutting costs, is the fact that nurses should be trained for more specific and more onerous duties as part of a cost-cutting programme, especially as it relates to the northern and far reaches of our province. I think this matter will come up further in estimates for more detailed discussion.

Speaking of nurses, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Colleges and Universities indicated recently that certain tuition fees were now going to be levied in relation to the various professions, such as nurses and registered nurses assistants, in the community colleges and universities.

One of the things that didn't come to my attention at the time was the effect of the change at the community college level, in that these students were now going to be in the position of not only paying tuition but also room and board. I know this has come as a shock to some of them who had planned on these courses, because I believe in the past their services in the hospitals and so forth were in compensation for their room and board.

I don't know exactly how this is going to work out in the weeks and months to come, but possibly the minister could enlighten me in this regard so that I may allay the fears of some of the young high school students who are contemplating this field in the early fall. It sounds as if these students are going to face a very substantial cost increase from possibly a nominal fee up to $1,000, $1,500 or $2,000, and it certainly is going to be a deterrent in many situations.

When I began my comments on this department, I was talking about the concept of a total health care programme for the people of our province, and of course one of these factors is dental care.

I think most of us concede that the province is eventually going to move into this; it certainly is accepted and being encouraged by the dentists themselves. There have been some comments on the programme of preventive work initiated on three- and four-year-olds. I believe the comments have suggested that this is not fast enough, not quick enough. I can certainly make those same comments,

but I believe that before we move into the tremendous expenditure of a dental care programme within our combined health services we must take all the preventive work in relation to dental care that we can possibly undertake.

Certainly this puts the emphasis on increasing the work among these pre-schoolers, and in fact, in the schools themselves, in the elementary systems, to do this preventive work as a cost-cutting and saving to the public in the future, when we do have this total health care programme covering dental work.

Combined with this, I think we should possibly renew our efforts in looking into the matter of nutrition in the school. I know this has been suggested from time to time in the estimates of the Department of Agriculture and Food. Especially from an area such as I come from, where they have a great number of food processing plants, they, of course, have a specific interest in this programme. I think those of us who view our younger generations and the good nutrition that they are getting from the baby foods and the junior foods that are being produced in great quantities and are available to most of us, can see that our children are gradually becoming healthier, bigger and stronger.

But there are those in the school system who simply cannot afford it—where their parents place emphasis on different matters than on nutrition—and here's a place where the school milk programmes have been wiped out and so forth. I think your department, Mr. Minister, should take another look at the ramifications of this, for the long-term health care of the people of our province.

Also, in relation to this matter, I have a resolution on the order paper in relation to the fluoridation of water. I know this is a very controversial topic, and hopefully it'll come up for debate in a couple of weeks in the private members' hour.

But I think the statistics will prove that this again is a cost saving to the individual family and to society as a whole. We'll find out anyway, when we get the chance to debate it. I notice you have the—what is it, the black ball or the eight ball on your desk there. I guess they're both the same aren't they?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He's behind it.

Mr. Paterson: We'll discuss that. I know it is an emotional topic. We should have some fun with that and some renewed interest when it comes up for debate.

I'm also interested, Mr. Minister, in a couple of other policy matters that relate to the nursing home situation, and I realize that we have debated this rather extensively in the past few weeks. I believe the policy and emphasis in this matter is a decision or an attempt to reduce from five to four beds the active treatment beds in the hospitals, to move them out back into the community, which, I hope, is a good forecast.

I don't really see how it's going to work. I know in talking to people in the nursing home field, they of course were upset, as was our party, in the delay in bringing in this extended care benefit to our people. But I think they felt that a clear statement on the tariff that was going to be paid to them should have been made several months ago, and then they could have really assessed the profitability or not of the particular operation.

Something that has been bothering me, Mr. Chairman, is a question that I asked of the minister some months ago. I asked whether or not he was aware that the nursing home association had supplied to the auditing firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell about 40 copies of financial statements to come up with a costing figure. At that time the minister indicated that he had no such knowledge that any such undertaking had taken place. I believe subsequent to that, in the debates on the bill on the nursing homes, I asked him again. He still denied that this had taken place to the best of his knowledge.

I would ask at this time, before the minister replies, if he has had a chance to check into this matter just to see if these facts were really not in the hands of officials of his department several months ago before this situation arose? I think we'll deal slightly more with the nursing home situation under the specific vote; but we have discussed it extensively here in the past and possibly that is enough to be said in the leadoff remarks.

We are quite interested in the announced programme of detoxification centres as they are going to apply in the few centres in the province, initially; and hopefully across the length and breadth of the province in months to come. I just wonder if there has been any change in the emphasis or thinking in relation to some of these smaller communities.

I realize the minister is limited by his budget and by the urgency, especially in the large centres, but I wonder if there is any long-range plan of supplementary detoxi-

fication centres in the smaller communities across our province.

Secondly, I would like an explanation, Mr. Chairman, as to the purpose of these detoxification centres? Are they simply going to be a sobering-up facility to accommodate, say, overnight guests; or are they in fact going to be treatment centres?

I believe we have 725,000 known alcoholics, and no doubt countless thousands more of whom we have no knowledge; and possibly a few more on the way who are developing from time to time. But I would like some explanation and determination of where we are heading in this regard.

Now on the subject of Parcost—and I was pleased to receive the report today on this matter; I haven't had time to peruse it. This particular subject, I believe, is going to be dealt with more thoroughly by my colleague from Nipissing when we get into the specifics of the estimates.

But in this regard, and on the drug care, I think there are two points I would like to make. One is that I, as a member, get numerous letters and phone calls from people who want to join drug plans. I believe that there are open periods through at least one company where anyone can join, although I guess it is the Green Shield in my area which doesn't, I believe, have an open period at all.

Mainly I would say these suggestions or complaints come from older people as groups who, of course, have a much higher instance and requirement of drugs, and knowing something about the insurance principle I realize it is just not feasible to take them in as a group other than as a governmental action, which possibly could be contemplated at some time.

But the second point I would like to make is the bit of conflict that exists in relation to Parcost. I have had two or three letters —possibly from self-interest groups. They indicate this situation is going to lead to a deterioration of our Canadian industry—it is going to put some of them out of business; that this is happening—if the doctor prescribes certain drugs and the pharmacist fills the prescription with, say, the "off-brand" name to the detriment of the Canadian company. As I say, this could be a self-interest point of view, but I just wonder. In the review committee on the products substitution report of June 1971 there is one paragraph that caught my attention:

> After a lengthy discussion, it became apparent that some drugs in the CDI might not be included on an equivalent basis because of insufficient data on bioavailability. It is recognized that there is a subtle but real difference between the DQTC stating that products are of comparable therapeutic effectiveness, and the DQTC stating that products are interchangeable.

I'm not a pharmacist. My colleague is, and possibly in the detailed examination of these estimates, we might get into that theory. But I think what is bothering the general public is advertised brand A, which we all think is great, but is brand Z, a substitute, equally as effective, physically and mentally? This I don't know, but this is what is bothering the public in relation to Parcost.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we are quite concerned with this total expenditure of some $2 billion on behalf of our nearly eight million population. We are very concerned about the rising costs. We are interested in getting into the position of negotiating fee structures with the medical profession. We feel that the medical care programme should move into the area of the tax base. We think there should be a strengthening of professional control by the Ontario Medical Association in policing its own group.

Our concern is on behalf of the people, both as individuals and groups, that we do have the best health care that is possible, not only in Canada but in the world; but that we must somehow attempt to educate the populace not to abuse the coverage that we, the taxpayers, are paying, and avoid the great stress and strain we are putting on the medical profession itself in trying to handle the great volume of work that is confronting it. We do hope in the months to come the minister and his advisers can ameliorate this situation, especially in relation to the tremendous costs of the programme offered to our people.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I have rehearsed some of the remarks which I am going to say about the health estimates already to the Ontario Medical Association meeting last Friday, so I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) is here. Oh, I see he is leaving—oh, but now he is staying to listen to the first part of them. He has heard some of it.

I have spoken already, particularly on this subject of health, in a number of other places, not that I have been reported or that anyone in particular listens, but it is not really that important.

I would like to take a fairly broad and substantial look at the present health scheme in Ontario and offer some tentative solutions and a lot of criticism. For the structure of my talk, I am indebted to the Book of Common Prayer and the quotation from the book is as follows: "We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us."

The question applies equally to the profession to which I originally addressed it, but I think it can be applied just as much to the government, which is sometimes, in my mind, in direct collusion with the profession. As a physician and a politician and also a member of the community, I think the quotation aptly communicates the condition of disquietude that pervades my thinking on the topic of discussion today.

This is a very complex subject which has caused considerable anguish and frustration among physicians, among politicians and, most important, among members of our society. To provide coherence to my arguments, I have divided my presentation into four relatable and sometimes overlapping categories. Number one is health care delivery system; two, medical practice; three, medical education; and four, medical profession.

Within each category I will follow the precepts of the Book of Common Prayer by examining that which has been left undone and which ought to have been done and that which has been done which ought not to have been done. Implicit in my position are: The Book of Common Prayer's conclusion that there is no health in us and, two, health is a connective, the linking pin between the four categories and the unsolved problems that we have left undone.

Number one subsection is the health care delivery system and health. In his address to the American Medical Colleges Association in Washington, October 1971, Senator Edward Kennedy charged:

> We must face the reality that the health care system has gone rigid and lethargic. It has become so inefficient, so irrational, so inward-looking, so inequitable and so parochial that we can no longer expect that it can reform itself.

In a similar vein, the editors of Fortune concluded:

> Our present system of medical care is not a system at all. The majority of physicians, operating alone as private entrepreneurs constitute an army of push-cart vendors in an age of supermarkets. Most patients pay for the cumbersome fee-for-service or piecework method, which involves separate billing for visits to doctors, shots, x-rays, laboratory tests, surgery, anaesthesia, hospital room and board, etc.

Drs. Herman and Ann Somers in their book, "Medicare in the Hospitals," defined the hospital system of health care as "largely a figure of speech . . . the result of uncoordinated involvement in institutions."

Heward Grafftey in his investigations contained in the recently published volume entitled, "The Senseless Sacrifice: A Black Paper on Medicine," concluded that health care has become "a cruel hoax."

I use, as you notice, a number of American quotations. It has to be explained in terms of both the American medical system and the Canadian medical system, specifically the Ontario-Canadian system, which have certain similarities and are complementary and differ only in a few non-structural elements. A lot of work has been done in investigating the present state of health care in Ontario, but the most thorough work, like in terms of how effective the fee-for-service system has been, has been done in the United States.

Obviously, the recognition is widespread that there is something fundamentally wrong with our health care delivery system. A growing frustration is emerging from various sources in society and frustration inexorably leads to anger and action of a basic kind. Mr. Munro, the federal Minister of Health, spoke of the "scandalous waste" in Canada's health service, as reported in the Toronto Star on Wednesday, April 19, 1972. My contention is that this statement represents a malaise in health care delivery, a malaise quickly and inexorably apparent to a growing, vociferous and unhappy public.

Why, we may ask ourselves, have we found ourselves in this unholy predicament? Are these assertions justified? What have we done that we ought not to have done, and how do we begin the process of extricating our health from the sorrowful and complex mess that we now find ourselves in?

Let us examine our problems. The health care delivery system in Ontario is funded on the treatment of illness. The delivery of care thus consists of: One, acute treatment in hospital as the base; two, physicians as the pivots; three, fee-for-service as the energizer and, four, massive government financial subsidy as the supporting structure.

The system is incoherent and inconsistent. Health care is maldistributed between rural and urban communities. Within the urban community the anomaly of inequitable distribution is clearly evident by way of the capacity for dramatic heart and organ transplants in some major hospitals, which in itself comprises duplicating services that are economically, socially and medically wasteful, and the substandard care afforded to minority and lower socio-economic groups. See for example, Alexandra Park Health Care Study, 1971, by the student health care organization of the University of Toronto, and Le Riche's study in 1971 of the Bayview community.

The tragedy of the maldistribution of health care is further exacerbated by the community's inability to persuade the managers of the system to redirect the type and kind of services toward all members of society. There is no mechanism by which the community can effectively bring about the redress of the inequities of the status quo.

With respect to the component parts of health care, I would briefly touch upon some of the major dilemmas inherent in the system. One of the pivots of the system, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, is the hospital. In the hospital the emergency department now deals more and more with routine medical and social problems. This is a significant barometer of the inaccessibility of primary contact medicine in the community.

The hospital is characterized by rigid compartmentalization, such that the patient becomes the compartmentalized possession of a sub-discipline which releases him from time to time to other specialty members in search of "good livers," "good spleens," etc. At a time when the patient is most dependent medically, socially and psychologically, he is the object of fragmentary attention.

There is a very good study to show what effect this has on the attempts of a patient to recover, or his return to hospital or continuance of his chronic symptoms, following the occurrence of the illness, in another American study called "Sickness in Society," by Duff and Hollingshead.

The hospitals, since Grecian times, have been the passive recipients of diseased and ill patients. Little attention has been directed by these institutions to partake in the active prevention of diseases in the community. This has been modified in a very token way in Toronto by some of the hospitals, like the Western, opening a number of satellite clinics. There is one that they opened in Parkdale. I consider it tokenism, largely because the little clinics that they open are almost usually directed under the control of the hospital. Though the financing can be different, they remain so closely linked to the hospital that all independent activities are almost impossible.

Significantly, in terms of the satellite clinic in Parkdale, if people consider that this particular clinic has been independent I can quote an example of how the original name of the clinic was changed from the Parkdale Community Centre to the Springhurst Community Health Centre, following an attack on the clinic by a group of doctors who are involved in the Parkdale area and call themselves the Parkdale Group. Following representation by that group to the various bodies, the doctors in the so-called independent satellite clinic reacted by having its name changed. So I am critical of the whole system of satellite clinics which only extend the power of a large active treatment hospital into the community, instead of actually bringing the community more into the operation of the hospital or making the hospital more aware of what it means to have a responsibility toward the community.

One other criticism one can express in this form is—and I still hope it is only a rumour—the Western Hospital's desire to withdraw from most of the community involvement by getting all its outlying satellite clinics, both mental health and otherwise, back into the large new complexes it wants to build, all under fairly close control of this large acute teaching hospital.

Teaching hospitals—to return to the more general statements about the hospitals—have traditionally been focused on unusual, bizarre and novel medical problems.

Now, the second part of the health care delivery system which is as important, is the doctors.

The pivots of the present system, primary contact physicians, are a diminishing group in relation to the population of physicians. See, for example, Queen's University study of Kraus et al, in 1971—and the Harvey, Bullock study of career switching away from primary care to specialization in Ontario, 1970; and the very latest study—which I've heard at OMA—by Spalding which suggested we are rapidly losing a number of primary care physicians, which are general physicians and family doctors in practice generally, because they are moving toward specialization.

Ambulatory care is typically expressed in the present system by drug therapy. The therapeutics, the most patient-oriented of the physician's actions, leave much to be desired. The high cost of drugs is a singularly powerful deterrent to the average citizen in accepting and taking responsibility for the prescribed therapy. It boils down to one variable: the success of therapy is conditional upon the patient's ability to pay. Many patients cannot afford this crucial aspect of health care.

What is best in contemporary medical care is, in fact, dependent most often on the number of variables, but the major variable is the medication which is prescribed. If the patient is unable to pay it, then, I think logically, most of the benefit of the therapy that the doctor has prescribed to a patient is dissipated by his inability to take the prescribed medication.

Moreover, as medical literature demonstrates with appalling frequency, a filled prescription represents less than 50 per cent chance that the therapeutic programme will be upheld with strict adherence. The physician cannot shrug his shoulders and disclaim responsibility here. The system of health care has been encapsulated by him and its success, its failure, remain his.

Fee for service: Not all professions are remunerated on a fee-for-service basis. We do not pay judges or university professors on this basis. Within the health field, it would be equally logical to pay nurses fees for services, such as giving an injection or doing a lumbar puncture; yet we do not do so. The fee-for-service system is the territorial imperative of the medical profession, and a prominent reason underlying government's huge and increasing subsidy through OHIP; all of which maximizes the cost of health care operations by directing people to the most expensive way of delivering any health service.

I will give you an example. Both ophthalmologists and optometrists are legally defined professionals who are qualified to measure visual acuity and prescribe glasses. However, OHIP covers 90 per cent of the ophthalmologist's bill and only two-thirds of the optometrist's. This encourages the consumer to use an extensively and expensively trained medical specialist for a job that could be done equally well, if not better, by a trained optometrist. This is a particularly anomalous condition in that it not only costs more to consult an ophthalmologist, but encourages an ophthalmologist, who is a medical specialist and who has spent 11 years in training with a great expense to society to end up mainly prescribing glasses.

The availability of health services in Ontario is effectively limited by the deterrents placed on seeking the services of a number of well-trained, legally recognized health care practitioners through OHIP coverage differentials.

For example, if I were to choose a health service performed by an osteopath versus an equivalent service performed by a physician, the difference in treatment received might well be nil. Yet with the physician, OHIP would cover 90 per cent of the cost; with the osteopath, OHIP covers nothing.

Moreover, in Ontario, the scope of osteopathic practice has been restricted almost entirely to the use of manipulative techniques. As a consequence of both this and the 100 per cent deterrent fee which OHIP tacitly levels against the osteopath, there are only 50 osteopaths in Ontario; and there are no training programmes for osteopaths in Canada.

Now, this may not be significant to people who have a natural or otherwise prejudice against osteopaths. Maybe you say: "We don't need osteopaths. We should concentrate entirely on physicians and in medical services as being preferable to what is available."

I would like to give you again an American example because it is perfectly relevant here. In contrast, there are 12,000 osteopaths practising in the USA. As an example of how, in fact, the medical profession in some states of the United States can perceive and can co-operate with osteopaths and consider them colleagues is best exemplified by saying that resolution recently passed by the Florida Medical Association can be used as a paradigm of the developing relationship between physicians and osteopaths in the USA. That resolution allowed for a professional relationship between doctors of medicine and osteopathy at the discretion of county medical societies. Effectively this could mean that osteopaths would be eligible to join the staff of the hospitals in the States; that is to say, the medical hospitals in the States.

In 46 of the 50 states in the USA osteopaths are licensed to practise medicine and surgery on the same terms as medical doctors. Lifting the present deterrents against osteopathy in Ontario may not be as essential in view of the number of osteopaths practising at the moment in Ontario, but it is essential on principle since it removes the peculiar

barriers that both the government—the Legislature—and the physicians have erected against a number of other equally well-endowed, trained, or practising health care workers.

At the very least, I think, when it comes to the profesion of osteopathy we should say that the profession has long since proved its worth. At the very least, what we can do is that the manipulative services which osteopaths presently perform and which would be covered by OHIP if performed by a physician, should be covered by OHIP when provided by an osteopath.

A similar situation exists in the case of clinical psychologists or counselling psychologists. Both registered psychologists and psychiatrists perform psychotherapy. However, the 100 per cent deterrent fee which OHIP tacitly levels against psychologists effectively discourages a patient from using the services of a counselling psychologist.

If I have a choice of having two equally good practitioners to go to for help and my expenses with one—which in terms of psychiatric counselling can be quite expensive and lengthy—are going to be paid by OHIP to the extent of 90 per cent of my bill, but for the other one who is equally good I will have to pay entirely from my pocket, I think there is no question in my mind that I will go to a psychiatrist instead of a psychologist.

Although I've specified already I'm strongly against the whole concept of the fee-for-service approach as fractionating and only producing spiralling expense for the province, nevertheless, I think if we are going to extend all types of services and maximize the services which are available in this province we must, in fact, extend the coverage for psychotherapeutic services to psychologists. I think in the same breath I should add that many professional social workers or MSWs who have been trained, often more effectively, in group psychotherapy and in counselling are also not covered by OHIP and consequently their services cannot be used as fully by people who want to consult them as they could have been if their services were covered by OHIP.

Thus OHIP, by reinforcing the use of the most prestigious practitioners and discouraging the use of the less prestigious—but not necessarily less effective practitioners—effectively overloads the former and under-utilizes the latter. The result of this can only be a direct diminution in the present quantity and indirectly a future deterioration in the quality of service.

The government subsidy is the last part of the health care system I would like to discuss. Since the early 1960s, hospital operating costs in Ontario, as reported by OHSC, have been rising by about 15 per cent a year, having risen from $193 million in 1960 to $762 million 1970. If this trend continues, we can expect a hospital bill of more than $1.5 billion by 1975, and an enormous $3 billion by 1980.

The total Department of Health expenditures will have tripled in the six-year period from 1966 to 1972, from $617 million to an estimated $2,028 million. Even though this later figure includes the effect of the OHIP programme introduced in 1969, a tremendous increase in health expenditures is obvious.

Unless costs are controlled, we are talking of a total Health budget, by 1980, of something in the order of $7 billion, an almost impossible sum for the province, or even a province subsidized by the federal government, to provide. And this is without the introduction of any new programmes, without dental care for children, without coverage for prescription drug costs, etc.

Despite the fact that we have one of the world's highest levels of medical competence and are expending huge sums per capita for health care services, Canada nevertheless ranked ninth in the life expectancy for males, seventh in the life expectancy for females and 17th in the rate of infant mortality.

As is well known, the Health budget at the moment is already the largest item of provincial expenditure. Some of the rise in medical costs has been attributed to increased life expectancy and the demand for more services. Technology has expanded to provide the means to satisfy those needs. But the whole pattern of medical care is also warped in favour of providing treatment in expensive hospitals.

The rising hospital costs are partially due, not to the necessary technological innovations but to a total lack of essential planning and extremely wasteful duplication of services, coupled with the fee-for-service system which pays for all the components of medical care on a piecework basis and profits the doctors when they prescribe more elaborate care than is needed.

The second large part of my examination of the health care system is the medical practice and health. Let me quote Dr. D. R. Rogers:

> As our technological and biomedical knowledge has increased, education programmes have focused more and more on

> the complexity of catastrophic illness. Our medicine has thus become increasingly hospital-based and physicians have become progressively unfamiliar with the total and actual health needs of our population.

Traditionally the predominant way of organizing the delivery of primary health care has been solo general medical practice. Solo medical practice, given the present state of medical knowledge and technology, is almost as archaic as the often praised doctor-patient relationship is an unrealized ideal for most people. Solo general medical practice is a cottage industry in an era of mass demand.

The present extent of demand for health services, which will continue to increase in quantity, cannot be satisfied by the present form of medical practice. In the long run, a major change embodying some kind of conceptual re-thinking is essential if the delivery of health care services is ever going to be organized in such a way as to be capable of satisfying the health needs of all Ontario residents.

The present state of medical knowledge and technology has already largely transformed most general practitioners into expensively trained personnel, whose major medical function is to serve as some kind of a doorkeeper for controlling entry into the more specialized areas of health care. The very developments that have raised contemporary standards for health care have also made solo medical practice the most expensive and frequently the least efficient way of delivering the necessary services.

Physicians represent an expensively trained and a scarce medical resource. The training and utilization of health technicians in a group practice represents one way of actualizing more broadly the high standards of the medical profession without continuing to squander the most basic scarce medical resource. It is highly inefficient use of a physican to perform (1) basically repetitive and time-consuming tasks which, though technical in nature, often make little use of the most developed technical skills on which the greater part of their training was concentrated; and (2) a number of socio-emotional interventions for which they have little form of training.

Recent studies of solo medical practice have shown that up to 50 per cent of a general practitioner's time is spent on providing general emotional succour, social support, family interventions and other counselling that could be described as being more of a psychological than a physical nature. And curiously, in the physician's words, while they are "extremely well trained" in terms of doing certain technical tasks well"—and indeed they are very good technicians when it comes to it—they are very ill-trained at the moment to do any type of counselling for their patients.

The third major segment of the examination of the organization of the health care system in Ontario is medical education and health. Dr. John Evans, the newly appointed president of the University of Toronto, has written in 1971:

> The environment for training, although ideal for intensive and specialized medical experience, has been much less suited to the educational needs of other health personnel and for the majority of physicians who will deliver primary care in the community.

In medical schools today students are trained both in undergraduate and postgraduate medical centres to identify and treat acute and chronic diseases typically found in university teaching hospitals. In general, only a small part of their curriculum is designated to ambulatory care. The consequence of this type of training is that approximately 45 per cent of graduating physicians are ill-prepared and ill-trained to cope with the realities of everyday practice.

Medical schools since the Flexner report are set up and operate on three educational assumptions. I would like to go over those three major assumptions, because I believe that in the majority of Ontario schools they still operate and only in one particular school, which is McMaster University in Hamilton, has the curriculum been changed to satisfy the more technologically correct and more up-to-date needs of our society.

Assumption one is that time is a constant and achievement is a variable. In effect, this means that a specific time is set for all students, irrespective of individual competencies, to complete their medical degrees. In devising medical curricula it is assumed that students with different capacities will, in a similar amount of time, meet the required standards for graduation.

It has been demonstrated by educationalists that many students are capable of acquiring and using complex information much faster and much more efficiently than many of their peers. Nevertheless, these students are obliged to while away interminable time awaiting their slower peers to complete the designated curriculum.

Many universities in the United States and in England, recognizing this need to accommodate individual differences, have made provisions to shorten the curriculum for the more competent students. Some of these schools also recognize the empiric fact that many students learn more slowly than others, and have lengthened the curriculum to ensure that these students reach a criterion of competence before granting the medical degree. Two examples of this kind of flexibility are the Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia, which has been graduating MDs five years after high school, and the University of Miami, which last year admitted a number of PhDs in science to a special intensive programme, concentrating on the clinical aspects of medicine. The Miami programme is a two-year programme.

Assumption two of the Flexner report is that theory precedes practice. In our medical schools in Ontario a curriculum has been created so that the students spend the first three years of medical school learning basic theory and fact. Only in the final undergraduate year are they systematically exposed to the clinical setting.

The assumption here is that, unless one has a lot of facts and a lot of theory stored in the mind, it is impossible to contribute to effective patient management. This assumption stands in direct contradiction to the way in which humans learn. The best example of preceding theory as a method of human learning has been fully documented by the Swiss scientist and psychologist, Jean Piaget, whose experimental work with children shows clearly that children at different ages must practise skill accomplishment before any notion of theoretical notions about such skills enters their minds. Another example comes from the psycholinguists at MIT and Harvard, who have shown that language is acquired before its theories and rules are understood by the child.

Some graduate schools—for example, law and business—proceed on the basis that practice precedes theory. These schools have not unduly suffered grave consequences as a result of this procedure. One of the reasons for taking this assumption to task is that medical students in the first year of medical school cry out for relevance. They demand to have contact with patients and not with cases which are provided to them to demonstate a theoretical viewpoint. Our medical schools, despite claims of flexibility and student-oriented curricula, have failed dismally to respond to this explicit student need.

The third assumption is that bright students make the best physicians. This particular assumption has led our medical schools in Ontario to select only those students with the best undergraduate academic records and the best scores on the MCAT. MCAT is a test given to the medical students prior to their entering medical school. There is accumulated evidence in the medical education literature that high scores on the MCAT and good academic records are poor predictors of success both for medical students and for physicians.

Yet, medical schools are reticent to change their selection criteria. Only one school in Ontario, McMaster, uses a selection method which permits students without a science background and without high grades to enter its programme. It is not unreasonable to deduce that the type of student selected by medical schools is the most malleable to be institutionalized into the framework of medicine as it exists today and most comfortably institutionalized into the powerful and remunerative profession that he is entering.

To say that these students are not likely to accept and be interested in pursuing careers in esoteric sub-specialties would be foolish. They will be interested. The loss, of course, for the community at large is that medical schools virtually ensure that few students will be happy to accept careers in the downgraded area of primary contact care. The same problem, if I may switch to my own specialty for a moment, exists with training psychiatrists largely in the general hospitals without ever allowing them to be trained in a large state hospital like one of our provincial psychiatric hospitals, or being involved in a community. You end up with a product, a psychiatrist who is much more interested in a private practice seeing largely neurotic patients and not particularly concerned with the fact that there are so many other people who need mental and psychiatric care, so that the system itself ends up producing parasites on the whole medical system, which produces very expensively trained individuals for a very few people.

In addition to the questionable assumption underlying student selection and medical curriculum, it needs to be pointed out that medical education tends to be elitist in both the way it recruits its students and the way it socializes them to be a class apart from the rest of the community. One has only to spend some time in a teaching hospital to realize the severe disjunction that exists between the life of a student in such a setting

and the ongoing realities of the world outside. The student rarely has time in his hospital training to be a participating member of the community at large. Students are isolated and cut adrift from social arrangements among human beings. Small wonder then that without this essential contact, this essential life experience and learning, they are incapable and unwilling to deal with many of the psycho-social aspects of medicine.

With regard to the selection of students who will be our future physicians, some 45 per cent of students come from families whose fathers have university education; these fathers represent a mere 7.5 percent of the total population of Ontario. Then, 12.8 per cent of our medical students are selected from the 0.4 per cent of the total population who are practising physicians. We select 79 per cent of our medical students from urban areas which constitute only 64 per cent of our total population. We select 5.1 per cent of medical students from rural areas that contain 4.7 per cent of the total population.

Many otherwise thoughtful people are urging that we increase medical school enrolment or that we build new medical schools in Ontario with the objective of ensuring larger numbers of physicians to meet health care needs. Both of these suggestions fail to recognize that increases in the numbers of physicians will only exacerbate the gap in reaching optimum health care needs in the community. There is no reason to suspect that the trend towards specialization and away from primary contact medicine will not continue, irrespective of increased numbers, until such time as we reconceptualize the nature, scope and direction of medical education and health care delivery.

It is unarguable that we need more physicians but what we do not need are more physicians dedicated to avoid primary contact care. Some suggestions apropos the reconceptualizing of medical education will be contained in my concluding remarks.

The fourth large segment for examination is the medical profession and health. When Dr. Sidney Lee of Harvard Medical School was asked what was wrong with American medicine, and equally with its Canadian or Ontario complement, he had an immediate answer: "Doctors." The doctors created the system. They run it and they are the most formidable obstacle to its improvement.

It is the doctor who decides which patients will be treated, where, under what conditions and for what fee; who will enter the hospital, for what therapy and for how long. The profession not only can but should be held accountable for the way it uses its power.

The doctors are highly visible and well-organized and although there is now a growing discrepancy between the official body—which in this province is the OMA—and the members, nevertheless the OMA still represents the views and aspirations of the majority of practising physicians. It is interesting to note that at the meeting on Friday which the Minister of Health and myself and Mr. Nixon attended to give our impressions and views of what are our respective policies on health, the majority of individuals who attend OMA meetings are now entering middle age or are older.

There were very few students and although the OMA claims to represent students, I believe there are only something like 38 students at the moment in the OMA. We have to take with a pinch of salt some of the claims of the Ontario Medical Association to represent all the physicians of Ontario, much less their much vaunted claim to represent health care for all of Ontario.

Recently some interesting questions have been raised as to how far does the control of the physicians permeate throughout the system of health care. Some of the power has shifted to the health services teaching complexes in conjunction with the large hospitals. Some interesting work has been done recently to suggest that some of the control of health care is now shifting away from the physicians in solo practice to the large hospitals. It is also shifting further and further toward the large medical-industrial complexes that are to dictate exactly what we need and what should be done. Though these trends have to be taken into account, the profession still largely controls the health field, involving both the associated personnel and resources.

It is interesting to assess, I think, the present attitude of the OMA by again telling you how I got involved in giving the views of the New Democratic Party to the OMA. The general secretary of the OMA, Dr. Sawyer, wrote a letter to the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) asking him to express some of our views to the organized body of medicine, and I was sent instead. I will quote from the second paragraph of this letter, which I consider to be very paradigmatic of the attitude of the profession. This is a quotation from Dr. Sawyer's letter to the member for Scarborough West:

> The members will be interested in having your opinion about the mechanism which may be established which will give the

medical profession equality with the government across the bargaining table.

The unconscionable assumption is that the profession and the government are equal and that only the mechanism of negotiations remains to be designed.

It is remarkable that a profession representing a group of individuals has come to a position where a statement like the one I have just quoted appears appropriate and reasonable in the context of the power wielded by the profession.

It is remarkable also that the profession which started as barber-surgeons has become so organized and powerful to the extent that the group, with its rights and responsibilities, appears to be almost a state within a state.

My analysis leads me to expect a metamorphosis in the whole panorama of health care. Physicians must, to paraphrase J. K. Galbraith, anticipate fundamental change or become its victims or allow the decision-making, which they have been resisting so far, to shift into the hands of the government and the community where it naturally belongs.

With this in mind I am anticipating a number of changes which I think are imminent. These changes I offer in the form of tentative solutions.

The solutions to the problems that I have listed depend upon the reconceptualization of the theoretical basis of the present structure. In its most simplistic form the theoretical change from the present model, usually called the medical model, to the socio-educational model involves a reconceptualization of the definition of health. Health must be seen not as an absence of illness but as a positive state of well-being. This reconceptualization shifts the emphasis from consideration of illness to concern with health, and consequently tacitly criticizes the present health care practices and provides possible solutions.

The importance of using models in terms of organizing health care systems cannot be underestimated. Although it may seem like semantic gamesmanship to use the words "medical model" and "social model," there is a gross difference in terms of organization and in terms of implementation of concepts between the two models which I have already stated.

Health, not being a commodity or a privilege, becomes consequently not something that can be given to one but something that belongs to one. By this, I do not mean that everyone will be healthy or that the individual can on all occasions treat himself when he is sick. What I mean is that it is the individual who is the one who is basically responsible for the state of his well-being. That is, all the information pertaining to health and illness belongs to the individual just as much as information pertaining to treatment.

The practical aspects of the universalization of health information can be exemplified by discussion of certain aspects of the present management of diabetes. A diabetic has been trained to understand the nature of his disease and the necessary treatment procedures which need to be undertaken to correct the imbalance. The patient understands that the condition is perennial and that he will both have to diagnose himself repeatedly as to what state he is in—for example, to test his urine and draw the necessary conclusions, and to administer the right amount of insulin, if necessary by injection—while all the time maintaining an overall survey of his dietary habits and keeping in periodic contact with the resource individual, either a doctor or a nurse as the case may be.

It is very clearly understood here that it is the patient who has the diabetes, it is the patient who must "manage" the problem and, though the physician or the nurse is available and should be consulted when the patient gets out of his depth, the professionals nevertheless remain on the periphery as the resource help.

I am drawing on this example to point out that this is an unusual way, and probably the most forward way, of looking at how to manage a long-term problem. This unfortunately is not typical of the way most practitioners operate in respect of their patients, it provides a very hopeful paradigm for the future.

When the professional suggests that the patient will not understand what his condition and treatment is all about, often the professional—in this case I think mostly of the physician—is merely afraid that the patient will understand only too well. Concomitantly some of the foolish mystique that surround the exercise of the healing arts will be dissipated, and the relationship between the therapist and the client will change from one in which the expert is doing things for a client to one in which two of them engage in a common endeavour on a more or less equal basis, with mutual respect and understanding.

An hon. member: Right on.

Mr. Dukszta: Practical implementation of this reconceptualization involves several steps:

Information about health must be democratized. By this I mean that it must be universalized; everyone has a right to information about himself and what is being done to him.

Emphasis must be changed from illness to prevention. What I mean by this is that at the moment we are concerned only with treatment when a patient is sick. We spend very little time on prevention demonstration programmes in which we attempt to bring about some kind of change in the way in which we will perceive of our health in preventive terms and not wait for the sickness to occur, although it is unavoidable on many occasions and of course the acute disease will have to be treated on the spot.

The means for health education in schools and for adults must be provided, with education as the necessary medium for the change of attitudes in both the client and the professional and the consequent assumption of responsibility by the individual for his health. Health education could start quite easily as an extra course in the first years of schooling.

There must be the creation of new health disciplines, re-education of the present disciplines and, so essential, a realignment of the status and role relationship between the disciplines. This is something that only people in the Legislature can do, for the time probably has come at the moment in the overall look at the health care that the relationship between the physicians and other health disciplines such as nurses and social workers must be seriously changed. The physicians for too long have in fact continued with a sort of primacy and control over other professionals.

Subsuming this change of emphasis is a basic concept that the responsibility for an individual's health is not a professional's responsibility but the individual's. As a doctor, in spite of the legislative and societal conventions that bind me in an ambivalent power relationship to the patient, the patient's problem is not my problem; it is his.

The most practical form to implement these concepts would be to provide a new organizational framework that would have two major components—the community health centre and the central planning body. The community health centre would be a basic unit in the new delivery of health services. These centres would be educative in nature and in base, concentrating on education and preventive programmes.

The primary contacts through the community health centre would be with a primary care worker, who would be either a nurse clinician or a specially trained individual. The physician would then move to the position of a specialized resource. This idea is really quite simple. If we have a very few and expensively trained physicians, and if we want to use their time in the best possible way and spread it as much as we can among all the people, the best way of treating them would be to treat them as if they were, in fact, already specialists and provide an intermediate rank of health professionals, either nurse clinicians or specially trained individuals to be the screening device, the first individuals that any person who is sick can go to see.

Some demonstration projects like this have already been done in parts of Ontario. The attempt to train child care workers is probably a very good example of what the government has done in attempting, in a small way, to introduce a new health professional to deal with the less technical aspects of medical care.

The multidisciplinary group of various professionals including the physicians would act as some kind of health team. In the most traditional way of operating at the moment in hospital or group practice or anywhere else, the physician remains in control of a hierarchical vertical system of a whole team of professionals. The changeover, which is again essential if you recognize the contribution and value of the other professions, especially nurses, is to recognize them as equal members of the health team, involved in the decisions pertaining to the treatment in each individual case, or the running of the community health centre. Other professions are also involved in this concept of a fairly even equilateral health team.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): You would have to pay the nurses a living wage.

Mr. Dukszta: Yes, you would.

The control of the day-to-day running of the centre may well be in the form of a partnership between the centre workers and the community.

Extension of the community health centre into the acute treatment centre would be by the referral system. This is best typified by an organization of internists, which would include psychiatrists but not surgeons, at the point of entry to the acute care hospitals.

Since a fee-for-service system with built-in remuneration differentials between the professions is inimical to any good health care system, and to a team approach, and too expensive to extend it in principle to all health professions, like nurses, it would have to be totally abandoned.

One of the major problems that exists is that the physicians, using a fee-for-service system and being the only health profession that does, are much more able to set up their own fee schedules and control their own income—not in comparison with the other professions, like the nurses, which depend on collective bargaining or largesse from the large hospitals. Yet, when you examine quite closely what the nurses and physicians do in actual pragmatic practical situations, arising when it matters when someone is sick, you discover that nurses often do an equivalent job to a physician but get paid infinitely less for their services.

This acute differential between the professions must cease. It is very unfair since the physicians represent only 15 per cent of the total health care workers, yet control so much more of the resources. They do not control the resources to any extent by the fact that they are so superior technologically or technically but by vested power as a large professional group which can exert tremendous bargaining power with the government, communities and everyone else, as if it were a monopoly.

The last point I make on the community health services is that it is implicit in this changed conceptual framework that the training of new doctors should be done by rotation through the community institutions, those largely concentrated in the community health centres, rather than through the specialties and sub-specialties of a teaching hospital.

What it would mean would be to bring out medical students from the present medical schools and to put them, for their training and practice, clinical practice, right in the community centres.

The second major component of this rethinking is that of an essential planning body. Though the community and the community health centre worker must participate fully in decision making at the local community health centre, it is essential that the overall planning, allocation of resources and the implementation of this broad conceptual model must be done in a central planning body—by which I mean the government and the legislative assembly.

I am reminded of T. S. Eliot's "Waste Land" where the shadow interposes between the image and the action. The shadow I refer to is the closed profession of medicine.

All the closed professions, like medicine and law have had delegated to them attributes of public authority. These attributes have been utilized to provide public services but also to protect themselves, and often to exert the control over the younger professionals. Though the professional body presents its public service as its main law, the promoting and defending of the socio-economic status and professional interest of its members is as important.

There is already a potential conflict set up in the profession between the public need and what is good for the members of the profession.

The social workers and the nurses are now in the midst of attempting to obtain the same rights and responsibilities for themselves as doctors. The other health workers will undoubtedly follow their lead.

The juridical disparities existing among various professions in the health field, which often share commonalty of interest but are differentiated in terms of privilege and status, cause the professions to oppose each other.

The result and effect of "corporalization of professions", to use the phrase from the Castonguay Report on the Professions and Society, leads to extreme fragmentation, juridical disorder and lack of proper overall control over resources and personnel needed to satisfy the societal need by the government, the community and the public at large.

The professional law in organizations no longer expresses the needs of modern society. Often it goes against the scientific concept as recently developed and generally accepted.

The professional law and organization is remarkable for its lack of adaptability. The profession, losing touch with outside reality, needs to behave as if it were responsible for the whole field. So actually what it does is merely represent its own interest in the field —masking it as a public good.

It has come to the point of individual anarchy, corporate anarchy, and the medical profession is in a state of corporate anarchy. Let me indicate why.

One, the way the profession squanders resources on the competing super-specialties—for example, our competing cardiac surgery empires in Toronto. The government does nothing to produce some kind of an order,

and to reorder these priorities and divide these responsibilities so that it would be cheaper if you have to do it, to do it in one place instead of doing it all over the various competing university hospitals.

Two, the way the profession sets up profitable priorities which focus on illness instead of prevention.

Three, in the recalcitrance shown by them toward public accountability as if health was solely their domain. The professional talks of the delivery of health as if health was a commodity to be given by the few when the plea is too many.

And finally by setting up of medical and ethical standards without public input.

I do believe that the government must negotiate with various groups in society because this is our democratic way of doing things in this country. But the government must negotiate not with the medical profession alone, but must negotiate with the whole health service field of which the physicians are only a minimal part.

The government must negotiate, but must also be an agent of change in the health field and an arbiter between the various professions in the health field. The government represents the community and must be central in planning, in setting up of priorities, and in the control of both the allocation of resources and the method of organizing health care systems.

I do believe that in the present, historically speaking, doctors, the physicians, the medical trade unions must now accept that they are only one of many health disciplines in the field. Consequently all negotiations must be done in partnership with other disciplines.

In the final analysis, the structural forces that are changing our society will eventually deprofessionalize and demythologize a number of professions, including medicine. This will be done by depriving them of the sole control over all relevant information, which will force elected representatives of the community, however unwilling the present government is in its collusion with the medical profession to do so, to centralize planning and control over this most neglected, yet so vital, dimension of human life which is health.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed, perhaps I can answer both the hon. members at the same time, since so many of their comments relate to the same things.

First of all, there is no question about the escalating health costs in the province. This is a matter that I've been speaking about now for some time. I've been telling the physicians, the Ontario Hospital Association, everyone else involved in the health field and the public generally that our budget, being in excess of $2 billion, can't go any higher. I don't like to hear people suggest that it is going to be two or three times this amount in a few years because, if it is, I don't know where the money is going to come from to pay for it.

By the same token, when we talk about the terrific increase of hospital costs today, I think we should remember that 75 to 80 per cent of all hospital costs are labour-related. As long as we in Ontario are going to continue to increase our fees, our labour costs and our hourly rates, as long as we are going to continue to insist on having our incomes increased every year by 10 or 20 or 25 per cent, as happens with everybody, then there is no way we are going to stop hospital costs from escalating.

We must be honest with ourselves. As long as we are going to pay higher salaries, if we are going to pay higher salaries to labour unions and other areas, we are going to pay them to hospital employees. There is no reason why they should be expected to work for less. For a good many years, hospital employees did work for a great deal less than other employees. I don't think they should be expected to; I think they should be brought up to the proper level. So, if they are going to be brought up to the proper level, then we must expect hospital costs to rise and, when they do, there is no sense in complaining about it. It is necessary that they are there; they are there to provide a service. But, I think that what we must remember is that hospital beds are not there as a convenience to either the doctors or the patients. They are there for a specific purpose, and they should only be used for that specific purpose. First, people using them should be sick and in need of the services provided by a particular institution before they are admitted there.

By the same token, over the last 35 or 40 years we have educated the public to become hospital-oriented. It's been the thing to do now for the last 40 years, to go into hospital for treatment for the most minor conditions. If we go back 40 years ago, we find that people didn't think of going to hospital unless they were really acutely ill, and

even the thought of going to hospital would frighten most of them into getting better.

At the same time, if a physician stopped on your street in those days to go in and see a patient, the whole street was out to see who was sick, because nobody would think of calling the doctor unless he was really acutely ill. Now we have got to the stage where people call doctors for emergency conditions which aren't emergencies. They ask the doctor to come for a house call for conditions for which they are perfectly capable of going to a doctor's office, and they go to the doctor's office for conditions they shouldn't be going for in the first place. If we could stop all this nonsense, there is no question about it we would be saving a lot of money.

When we come to the tax base versus premiums, again, I don't think there is anyone who will argue that if we were to do away with premiums completely we would have to pick up between $500 million and $600 million that we get in premiums. This would have to be added to the tax one way or another. It would cut down on administrative costs. At the same time, it would put a lot of people out of work. It is something we have to give a lot of thought to certainly, whether or not it would lead to increased abuse of the programme or whether it would assist in cutting down the cost.

We know it will save on the cost from that standpoint. We have a terrific public relations programme, a big selling job, to do to everyone concerned in the health field as well as the public, to convince them to use their facilities properly. I think we should work toward this as a group.

The auditor's report was mentioned, where it talked about the money that we weren't able to reclaim; under the old system, as you will remember, individuals on welfare didn't get their insurance paid for them. In many cases they are admitted to hospital, without any insurance naturally, and the municipalities refuse to pick up the bill. This money just isn't collectible—that is what it amounts to. The people who incur the accounts haven't the money to pay for it, the municipalities didn't pay it, and I expect that will be written off.

Since the advent of our new scheme, all those with restricted incomes, as you know, get the premiums at a reduced rate, and without any taxable income it is paid for them. Like the hon. member, I have had a fair number of individuals come to me who are admitted to hospital and who didn't even bother applying for the insurance, even though they knew they could get it. Once this is brought to our attention we see they are reinstated, or if they didn't have it beforehand we see they do get the coverage. This is an item that will gradually be removed from the auditor's statement.

The other subject the member brought up under the auditor's report was the matter of canteen surplus funds and the patients' pin money. The canteen funds are those amounts that were accumulated at various institutions and, as he has said, amounted to $226,000 as of March 31. They come under the direct supervision of the individual canteen boards at the individual hospital; they are used to provide additional benefits for the patients, either collectively or on an individual basis. By the same token, the patients' pin money totalled $114,000, and that too was to provide benefits to the patients in the institutions. But these funds are not utilized for the purchase of items in the hospitals that ordinarily purchase under their estimates. I think the members realize that—it is for something additional.

Since this was brought to my attention earlier this year I have been visiting the various institutions, discussed it with them and suggested that they should be using more of the money in providing more of the amenities for the patients that are in there. These funds were to be available for them and they shouldn't be accumulating them to this extent. I think you will find that in the future this is what will happen.

As far as negotiation in medical fees is concerned, I too feel we should some up with a realistic schedule. I have been saying this around the province for some time—there is nothing new about it. I spoke to the annual meeting of the OMA just last Friday. I truly believe that we should now come up with a schedule of fees that is realistic to meet the day's needs. Ninety per cent of the doctors in the province have intimated they are accepting 90 per cent of the fee schedule as a 100 per cent thing.

I see no reason why we shouldn't get together and say, "Look, let's come up with a realistic fee schedule. We can pay 100 per cent of the fee and then have it renewed every two years—on the cost of living if you like, or something along that line—not this nonsense of having anybody come up and say we are going to bring in a new fee schedule next year, maybe you won't like it." I would like to see something along this line developed. I am very optimistic. I am

hopeful that we will be able to do something about it.

Paramedical personnel are again an area that I have been talking about for some years. I am very interested that we do explore every avenue of using paramedical personnel—when I say paramedical I am talking about paradental personnel too—in the whole health field. But I think that we should be realistic and face up to it. Hopefully as long as I am here we are not going to introduce into the health field another group unless they are properly trained. I think that there is lots of scope here for paramedical personnel because you know in various parts of the province we are now experimenting with them. I think that once we decide that they are needed, I think we should make sure what training they should have, and make sure that they are properly qualified and licensed to practise in whatever particular area they are going to practise.

I notice that the member for Parkdale suggested that osteopaths should be covered under our programme. Well, osteopaths are covered under the treatment programme under OHIP; and they are paid on the same basis as chiropractors are at the present time. But I am very anxious to see that we extend into this area.

Quite frankly, we could provide very good care and much more economically in many instances if we were to use paramedical personnel. We already have in the province nurse assistants working on a trial basis with doctors and making house calls and so on; and to screen out the patients and to save valuable time. Hopefully, this is going to be successful.

We have other plans with McMaster University in northwestern Ontario with the use of paramedical personnel and I expect to have this in operation before very long. The research has been done, the studies have been done, the plans are being laid and they will be in operation very shortly.

As a result of all these plans, hopefully we will come up with what is the best thing to do in all these areas. I don't think for one minute that we are going to come up with a plan that we can say we can parachute into any part of the province and it is going to be the ideal situation. I think that we are probably going to find that all these things are going to have to be tailor-made to meet the needs of the particular area.

This is the one reason why I am anxious to see the development of community health councils. I think I have spoken before in here about the fact that we have had a couple in the province on a trial basis for two or three years. We are prepared to expand them. Thunder Bay is anxious now to establish a community health council. Sault Ste. Marie is anxious; Ottawa is anxious. Gradually as the community health councils are set up, they will have the responsibility not only of planning the needs for their community, but of instituting the programme and administering it to make sure that the proper facilities are there and the patients are in the proper facility at the proper time.

The question of nursing fees: As you know, government decided that nurses and nursing assistants should pay tuition fees. This wasn't done without a great deal of thought. In the four years I've been in the Legislature, I have had presentations on several occasions from nursing associations; from the Ontario Nursing Association, the College of Nurses.

In discussion with nurses at various hospitals across the province, it was apparent they did not like being treated differently from anyone else and that they thought that they should be treated the same as any other student taking post-secondary education. The day has passed when a nurse worked like a charwoman in order to get her training. Of course it has passed; and thank God it has. Most of our training is now done in the classroom with some interning in the hospitals. The tuition fee starting this fall, as you know, is $250 a year. It will be for both first- and second-year students, but at the same time they will be expected to pay room and board. But starting this fall, only the new students pay their room and board and those who are already started in the programme won't be expected to do that for the rest of their course.

Mr. Paterson: Will they be paid for their internship?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Pardon?

Mr. Paterson: Will they be paid for their work in interning?

Hon. Mr. Potter: As I understand it, they will be.

Then, of course, there is the area of student loans to go into a post-secondary school of education. As you know, when students make application for their loans they are expected to have saved $500 every summer from their summer employment. We won't be expecting the nurses to do this, because they don't get the summer months off; so that the money will be available to them. They don't need

to be concerned. There are plenty of bursaries available in addition to the money that will be made available through the loan programmes. So I really don't anticipate any particular problem.

Fluoridation: Boy, there have been lots of hot potatoes around but I think that was probably the hottest. As you know, every time fluoridation is mentioned—why, I mentioned it once before away back in the famous year of 1969 and at that time I had letters from all over the province—from both sides, I might add. It's really a hot one.

If we talk to dentists and those in favour of fluoridation—and quite frankly, I'm in favour of it. I live in the country where the water isn't fluoridated, so I had my children taking fluoride tablets from the time they were born and I must say it did have a big effect on their teeth. I haven't seen any harmful effects on them, or any other effects on their health.

There are people who will bring in all kinds of reasons why you shouldn't add fluoride to water. At the present time I think about 60 per cent of our municipal water supplies in Ontario are now fluoridated. Our government's policy is that this is a local option. I have no reason to suspect that the government has any intention of changing this policy.

All of us keep insisting that we should allow the local people to make their own decisions. We're trying now to establish community health centres so that the decisions concerning health—all health—will be in the hands of local individuals so, perhaps, this is where it should be left.

Nursing homes: the question was asked, is it wise to reduce the number of active treatment beds? Quite frankly, I think they should be reduced. I'm not happy, I never have been happy, about the percentages that have been established for the various numbers of beds. This again, I think, has to be settled on a local basis.

You may find that four beds per 1,000 is enough in one section of the province. Then, you may find that you need six per 1,000 in another area, or you might need only three per 1,000 in yet another area.

But certainly, now that we are providing other types of accommodation, where we are extending our chronic care facilities, where we are now covering nursing homes, where we have the home care programme in operation, the active treatment beds should be reduced—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! It being 5 o'clock we will have to—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Just as I get going nicely you shut me up!

Mr. Chairman: Well, we are contravening the private members' hour at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: Don't feel put down; we are on your side.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR:

SIMCOE DAY ACT

Mr. G. E. Smith moves second reading of Bill 25, An Act respecting Simcoe Day.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, the establishment of Simcoe Day to recognize and honour the invaluable contribution by Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe, who had so much to do with his province's beginning, merits both our support and action.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if I were an accomplished composer like one of the famous native sons from my area, Gordon Lightfoot, I would have composed a song. Perhaps we could call it "The Saga of John Graves Simcoe", and at this point I would burst into song after you, Mr. Speaker, had agreed to demonstrate your musical ability, for which you are so well known in your own constituency, by accompanying me with your guitar.

And I suppose we could also conjure up an even greater production by assuming that under your direction the page-girls and the page-boys might have demonstrated a ballet which would further pay tribute to the subject matter of this bill during second reading. And I suppose we could even take it a step further and I could have called upon the hon. member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens), the hon. member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) and I believe the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes),

who, as I recall it, so ably demonstrated their vocal attributes on the occasion of your annual dinner.

However, inasmuch as I am not a composer, I will confine my remarks to a speaking version rather than a musical version. And I would like to briefly go over some of the major contributions of Col. Simcoe to this province.

In 1790, Col. Simcoe was elected a member of the British Parliament where he first took part in the debates on the bill by which the Province of Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada. He therefore had an intimate knowledge of what was intended by that bill, and no man better qualified to be governor of this province could have been selected.

In 1791, he was made first governor of Upper Canada, now Ontario, which had recently been settled by the United Empire Loyalists—a grand body of men to whom but scant justice is done by our own historians and whose descendents to this day are frequently known as the backbone of Canada.

In 1972, Col. Simcoe was sworn in as Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada on July 8, at Kingston, Ont. From July 9 to July 21, he held the first meeting of the newly-appointed executive council in Kingston at St. George's Church.

His first task, upon his arrival at Kingston in 1792, was to organise the civil government of this colony and, following the traditions of British colonial administrations, the form of government envisaged for Upper Canada differed profoundly from the republican institution of the United States which virtually surrounded the colony.

An elected assembly with the legislative council was brought into being and an executive council was appointed to advise the Lieutenant Governor.

Simcoe had also found it advisable to divide the old districts of Upper Canada into 19 counties. The county of Simcoe, in which my constituency is located, as well as the constituencies of the hon. member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. Evans) and Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), bears his name. These counties still exist today, although in some cases, their boundaries have changed. The administration of justice, the development and control of a militia force and the allocation of elected representation in the assembly were all facilitated by this move.

In September of 1792, he selected Newark, now Niagara-on-the-Lake, as the capital and met with his first Legislature. He energetically organized the new province, providing especially for its agriculture and military defence; and during that winter Simcoe toured the southwestern part of Upper Canada as far west as Detroit. He had founded London on the River Thames, both of which he named, in the county of Middlesex.

In May 1793, the second session of the first Legislature met at Newark. One very important Act passed during the second session concerned slavery. Simcoe was determined to eliminate this obnoxious practice, although the final legislation only provided for its gradual abolition. It did, however, forbid the further importation of slaves into Upper Canada and provided freedom for those born in the province on attaining the age of 25 years.

There was at this same time a growing tension between Britain and the United States. Simcoe, therefore, set his Rangers to work constructing Dundas St. from the present site of London to the head of Lake Ontario. This road was to provide a less exposed military route in case of war.

It might be interesting to note too that in the fall of that year, when Simcoe journeyed to Lake Huron, he named Lake Simcoe for his father.

Having determined to move his capital, he chose the site of an old French fort on Lake Ontario for the new town and in 1793 founded York; and thus York became the city of Toronto in 1834.

Soon after the year 1794 a house was built for him on a hill overlooking the Don River. Simcoe named the house Castle Frank after his son Francis; and if my memory serves me correctly, the hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) indicated today that she was present on Saturday, I believe, when an historic plaque was erected designating this historic landmark, Castle Frank.

In May 1794, the first survey for Yonge St. was undertaken. Construction continued, with interruptions, until the road northward was completed in 1796.

Simcoe's governorship lasted only about four years, and throughout his term of office Simcoe attempted to fortify the colony against the powerful influence of the United States. Even in those days, Mr. Speaker, we had problems coping with the influence of our neighbours to the south.

He encouraged emigration to Upper Canada by advertising the colony's advantages throughout the Atlantic states. At the same

time he prudently undertook road construction in the interior of the province in order that British supply routes would not be so readily exposed to American attacks in the event of war. He fortified the British frontier posts at Detroit and Niagara, which were technically in United States territory but were held by the British until the ratification and execution of Jay's Treaty after 1794.

It is a good measure of Simcoe's ability and success that he guided the infant colony safely through the first few years of its existence with so many dangers on every hand; and he succeeded in establishing the solid governmental and social foundations on which the province has developed for more than 175 years.

In most other countries, Mr. Speaker, historical figures are remembered for their contribution to their nation by naming a public holiday after them. Washington, Lincoln, Columbus and several others in the United States are examples. In Ontario alone we have historical figures just as outstanding. There is John Graves Simcoe, of whom I have just been speaking, Major-General Sir Isaac Brock, William Lyon Mackenzie, Rev. John Strachan, John A. Macdonald, and others of prominence and eminence who are known from coast to coast. These are but a few who should be known and remembered and recognized for their sacrifices and contributions to the establishment of our system of law, order, freedom and justice.

It has been said that if a nation does not value its freedom, it will lose that freedom. Canadians who carelessly take their great heritage for granted should give consideration to this proposition today.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I advocate changing the name of one of our holidays—the first Monday in August—from Civic Holiday, which is really a meaningless term anyway, to Simcoe Day, in honour of the founder of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I am not alone in my endeavour to establish Simcoe Day. I have here letters and communications from individuals, municipalities and organizations throughout this area who would like to support this bill. I am sure that many members of this Legislature, on both sides of the House, have received similar communications from municipalities and interested people in their areas.

I quote first from a letter from Mr. Norman W. Long, chairman of the John Graves Simcoe Memorial Foundation, and I quote in part:

> It is our opinion that such provincial recognition is more than deserved, in commemoration of a man who embodied the highest principles of public service, whose health suffered badly as a result of his unceasing activities in the fledgling colony, and in whose debt we must always remain.

Also, I have a copy of a letter to the Premier (Mr. Davis) of the province from Mrs. June Marks who supports the legislation. I have a copy of a letter that was received by the member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch) from Mrs. Ann Stokes, president of the Niagara Historical Society, who says:

> We hope to tell you that we heartily support this measure. As you are probably aware, the municipality of Niagara-on-the-Lake last year called August's Civic Holiday, Simcoe Day. The society supported this by holding a special event in our museum on that day last August. We held a Mrs. Simcoe's tea and about 100 friends and members attended.

They go on also to comment on the junior Simcoe dancers. They hope to hold a similar event this year.

I have a letter from the clerk of the town of Milton, who supports the bill; also from the town of Richmond Hill, which is supporting the bill and has indicated so to the member for that area; a letter from the town of Thorold, supporting the legislation; from the town of Mississauga, which has sent its support through the hon. member for that area; a letter from the town of Dundas; also a copy of a letter that was sent to the member for Peterborough (Mr. Turner) from Mr. T. H. B. Symons, the president and vice-chancellor of Trent University, adding their support to Simcoe Day; and also from the past-president of the Orillia Historical Society, Mr. Allen Ironside.

And perhaps in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I could quote from an item that was in the Globe and Mail on April 27, in Bruce West's column, which I think more or less reflects the thinking of many people throughout the province in supporting this endeavour. Bruce West says, and I quote:

> It is my understanding that there is a private member's bill somewhere in the hopper of the present session of the Legislature at Queen's Park to make what has hitherto been known as Civic Holiday in Ontario, Simcoe Day in honour of a man who has had so much to do with this province's beginning. The bill is spon-

sored, appropriately enough I suppose, by G. E. Smith of Simcoe East.

After all, the term Civic Holiday doesn't really mean much to me. But Simcoe Day would, because it would help to bring a better focus on our past; and any move of that kind is surely a step in the right direction.

He goes on to say that:

It is not that Col. John Graves Simcoe performed any superhuman deed to get what is now Ontario under way. If we try to glamourize him in that manner, we may defeat what would be the main purpose of Simcoe Day—to draw attention to the manner in which the sturdy pioneers of early times literally carved what was to become Canada's most prosperous province out of the virgin forests.

It is not that Col. Simcoe performed any outstanding feats. However, it might not do us any harm to look back on those times at least once a year, and Simcoe Day might be just as good an anniversary as that upon which to do so.

As I said, civic holiday means little unless we look to the future, because we cannot live in the past.

Mr. Speaker, Canadians should learn more about the system of government from which we all benefit today as the result of this man's outstanding leadership. He exemplified the belief that a citizen had a duty toward his country and this, Mr. Speaker, is what Canadians really mean when they stand up and sing "O Canada, we stand on guard for thee."

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter the debate on this private member's resolution. The member for Simcoe East has brought forward this suggested bill and I support it. Various of the municipal councils including that of the city of Kitchener, have also agreed with this view.

I think we can all agree that of the holidays celebrated in Ontario, the first Monday in August is one of the most pleasant of summer days. Unfortunately, the present name for it is meaningless. The term Civic Holiday seems only to conjure up the fact that civil servants and municipal employees are not at their posts on that day.

The member for Simcoe East has referred to the personal history of John Graves Simcoe and here are two separate views of the work he did, written 110 years apart. In a book entitled, "Sketches of Celebrated Canadians," Henry J. Morgan wrote this in the style of 1862:

We cannot picture to ourselves a more dismal or a more thoroughly dejected plantation than was Upper Canada at the time of which we speak. Governor Simcoe, therefore, had not too much reason to think himself honoured by the appointment conferred on him by his grateful sovereign. Nevertheless, he entered upon his duty with a resolute heart. Newark, now Niagara, was made the seat of government, firstly. Consisting of a legislative assembly and council, the former contained 16 members only and the latter was still smaller. The parliament was convened so early as the 17th of September of the same year.

Secondly, he appointed an executive council composed of gentlemen who had accompanied him out and some who already resided in the province. He had the whole country surveyed and laid into districts and invited as much immigration as possible in order to swell the population.

When we see the flourishing and prosperous cities, towns and villages of Upper Canada, may we not truly say that for these we are in the first instance mainly indebted to that brave and gallant-hearted soldier who left no ends untried to fulfil his duty and to make Upper Canada a valuable and enviable dependency of the British government.

The provincial corps was also raised by command of the King and Col. Simcoe was appointed colonel of it. This corps he also called The Queen's Rangers after his old regiment.

Mr. Speaker, while Mr. Morgan's language is far too flowery for our day, the facts that he has cited are correct. Ontario flourishes. The village of muddy York is now our capital and a city of some two million people. The regiment he founded continues in its service within the Canadian forces. The more recent comments of Mr. Bruce West, to which the member for Simcoe East referred, did appear in The Globe and Mail. I think one sentence he says is exceptionally worthy of repetition, and I quote:

It is not that Colonel John Graves Simcoe performed any superhuman deeds to get what is now Ontario under way. If we try to glamourize him in that manner, we may defeat what should be the main purpose of Simcoe Day—to draw attention to the manner in which the sturdy pioneers of those early times literally carved what was to become Canada's most prosperous province out of the virgin forests. I think it is that latter part that we should be dwelling upon as we consider the prospect of changing the name of this date.

I agree with those latter sentiments of Mr. West. The riding I represent is in that first inland part of the province that was settled in 1799. Many Pennsylvania Dutch, as they were called, made their way up from Pennsylvania and the other American states and wished to live in Ontario, or what became Ontario, in peace.

As good farmers and artisans, they preferred the guarantees of British protection as well as the right to be exempt from military service and the bearing of arms.

These plain people wrested from the forest some of the very best agricultural land in Ontario. Their story is well told in books, such as Mabel Dunham's "The Trail of the Black Walnut".

John Graves Simcoe was no longer in Upper Canada when they arrived in the first years; he had returned to England by way of Santo Domingo and was in command at Plymouth awaiting the expected invasion of England by Napoleon's Grand Army.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is wise to celebrate the virtues and principles of the pioneers of our society as we move through times in which the only constant is change. Simcoe Day can remind us of our past and upon that knowledge we can build the future.

I hope that all of the members of the House will support this useful bill and that the government will bring it into force, so that in August of this year we can celebrate and memorialize through the name of one of our pioneers the efforts of all of those who have contributed to the building of our province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, my reaction to this private bill is a very mixed one.

On the one hand, I can quite understand the feelings of the hon. member for Simcoe East that he wants to make some change to the civic holiday, which, as he indicates, is meaningless, and to get some holiday that might be associated with one of the great names of our history. However, having listened to his rather glorified account of Simcoe, I must confess that I think the record should be completed. When it is completed, my mixed feelings perhaps will be more understandable. When I conclude, it is just possible that if we are going to pick a day and name it in memory of somebody who was a founder and played a major role in building this province, that there might be a better choice than Colonel Simcoe.

Colonel Simcoe was an active officer in the British army during the American rebellion and he learned to detest everything American, its way of life, its government. He went back to England with those feelings very well developed. When it became apparent that he was going to be appointed the first Lieutenant Governor of the colony of Upper Canada, he began to dream dreams. Sitting in front of the crackling fire in his fireplace, he imagined that he could build out in the forest wilderness of North America a little Britain. He took a look on the map at this lake peninsula that stretches from Niagara and York through to Windsor and it had a magnificent possibility. It jutted down into the United States. It could be a showcase to remind Americans of the inferiority of their society, of their form of government and a place where he might build a duplicate of Britain that would show all the things that were superior in Britain. He was completely uncritical.

An hon. member: He was a Waffler.

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore—no, he didn't waffle; you bet he didn't waffle—his concept was that he was going to build out in this part of the country a Britain in which London would become the second London and the capital of Upper Canada.

An hon. member: He was right for a few years.

Mr. MacDonald: He spent his time, after that had been pushed out of the realm of possibility, in building military roads up Yonge St. to Barrie and out Dundas St. to London.

His concept was of an aristocratic society. He said he wanted to have his legislative council hereditary. Indeed, he contended that the members of the legislative assembly—not the council—should be made up of half-pay

officers in the militia, and they and they only.

He was going to build an aristocracy out in the wilds of North America around the half-pay officers of the militia. He wanted to have a university and he got from the Home Secretary Dundas a note back that, after all, "countries make a university and universities don't make a country." I suspect he got that because it was going to involve a little more money than the British treasury was willing to put forward at that time. The folly of Simcoe's concept of what he wanted to build in North America was saved by a number of people, but leading them was a man by the name of Richard Cartwright.

I don't need to quote anybody else, for once, because some 30 years ago I wrote my master's thesis on the Hon. Richard Cartwright. The Hon. Leslie Miscampbell Frost, some 10 or 11 years ago, appropriated funds for the publication of three theses of Upper Canada which you can read in the library. I invite the hon. member from Simcoe East, and anybody else, to read chapter four, entitled: "A Founder of Upper Canada."

This is an example of the kind of thing that Cartwright did in bringing this British aristocrat out of his dreams down to the reality of North America, particularly of this province of Upper Canada. Instead of squandering money that would be of no value at all, or of little value other than to build his own grandiose schemes, what Cartwright wanted was to build a colony.

For example, the Queen's Rangers: Their job was to build roads and bridges to link the settlements of Upper Canada. Instead, they spent most of their time building that military road out to La Tranche—the River Thames it's now called, near London—where there wasn't a single inhabitant. Can you think of any worse folly?

I think, Mr. Speaker, I can perhaps make my case if I let the record speak for itself—by a few direct quotes from the original records of that date. For example, this is Simcoe writing back to—well I've forgotten to whom he was writing, I can't find that, but it's irrelevant. "In my passage from Montreal to Kingston," Simcoe wrote, "I understand that the general spirit of the country was against the election of half-pay officers into the assembly, and that the prejudice ran in favour of men of a lower order who kept but one table." That is, who dined in common with their servants. Forgive me, but those were the views of the man whose name you want to use for the civic holiday in the Province of Ontario; that kind of misplaced aristocracy!

Let me go on. In the words of Richard Cartwright:

> There is no maxim more incontestable in politics than that a government should be formed for a country, and not a country strained and distorted for the accommodation of a preconceived or speculative form of government.

I think a very appropriate observation.

Again, at a later date, Cartwright wrote and he said:

> I hope this plan [the plan of Simcoe] will not be persisted in, for it appears to me as complete a piece of political quixotism as I recollect to have met with and would be going out of the way of the inhabited parts of the country, instead of coming to government. If the grandiose scheme were persisted in [he warned the government] will waste its sweetness on the desert air, the energy will be spent where it has nothing to operate upon, and money will be lavished away where it can be of little permanent advantage to the province, however useful it may be to some individual.

Let me give you a magnificent glimpse of Simcoe and Cartwright, the man who brought him in touch with reality. I should remind the House that prior to 1784, if a person wanted to get married in what is now known as Upper Canada, he had to go to the commanding officer in the local military establishment, who read the marriage ceremony from the Book of Common Prayer, and he was married. After 1784, he went to a justice of the peace.

Simcoe was rather shocked by this. Simcoe was determined that he was going to establish the Anglican church as the established church in Upper Canada, and anybody who was not married in accordance with the rites of the Anglican church, if there was a child, it was a bastard. As simple as that! Now he rather offended Cartwright, because Cartwright was a pioneer who came as a United Empire Loyalist to this country in 1778, very loyal to Britain, and an Anglican very loyal to the Anglican church; but a realist. When he got married, he got married by one of the military officers. In effect Simcoe was saying that his wasn't a legitimate marriage.

When he brought in his marriage bill, it was Cartwright who fought it to a standstill and Simcoe withdrew it so he could have

control of the situation. He brought it in again the next year, and he was going to permit those who were illegally married to come before a representative of the Anglican clergy and to swear that they were living as man and wife whereupon it could all become legal.

But the dissenters, who incidentally were 95 per cent of the population—only five per cent were Anglican at that point—the dissenters, namely the Presbyterians, objected to this. And they might have been able to make their mark but the Mennonites and Junkers came in and contended that they should have the right too. So the Presbyterians objected to sharing the right with the Mennonites and Junkers, and it was left as only the Anglican privilege to be able to regularize these marriages. But the man who fought the thing to a standstill in terms of this unrealistic kind of approach once again was the Hon. Richard Cartwright.

I want to conclude with a final comment which I think sums up magnificently what Cartwright did in terms of saving Upper Canada from the folly of John Graves Simcoe.

> I fondly imagined that we would sit down cordially together to form regulations solely for the public good, but a little experience convinced me that these were the visions of a novice and I found our executive government disposed to calculate their measures as much with a view to patronage and private endowment as to the prosperity of the colony. Such policy is as short-sighted as it is illiberal, and however little it may be noticed at present, if persisted in and pushed very far, will unquestionably be sowing the seeds of civil disorder and perhaps laying the foundations of future revolutions.

That was written in 1793. The Hon. Richard Cartwright divined so exactly what was going to happen as a result of the forces that Simcoe had started that he foresaw the emergence of the Family Compact and the rebellion of 1837.

So, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you will understand now why I am not an enthusiast for calling the Civic Holiday Simcoe Day. I would be inclined to say call it Cartwright Day. It might be much fairer and much more accurate. But if Simcoe isn't known to many parts of the province, except around Lake Simcoe, Cartwright perhaps is even less known, and therefore I am not going to push the point. My point is that I think there are more appropriate figures whose views would be more worthy of commemoration in one of our civic holidays than those of John Graves Simcoe.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Simcoe Centre.

Mr. A. E. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, the establishment of Simcoe Day to recognize and honour the contributions of the Lieutenant Governor—and I must remind the hon. member that John Graves Simcoe was the first Lieutenant Governor of Ontario—merits everyone's support, as my hon. friend from Simcoe East has indicated. He also gave you much of the history of Simcoe's accomplishments.

The large county to the north of York was named Simcoe, and not only is Simcoe county the largest county in Ontario in size but it has more municipalities, although some are very small. In 1958, the year I was warden of Simcoe county, we had the fourth largest governing body in Canada, with 52 members—surpassed only by the governments of Canada, Ontario and Quebec. In 1972, I am informed, Simcoe county is the seventh largest government body in Canada.

In 1782, Simcoe married Elizabeth Posthuma Gwillim, . . . and named three townships after the Gwillims—West Gwillimbury, where I live, and North and East Gwillimbury, in the region of York. Lake Simcoe was named by Simcoe and is the largest fresh water lake in the world.

An hon. member: No, it isn't!

An hon. member: I could name three more that are larger.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Evans: Yes it is—and the clearest! It is known not only for its clear water but for its excellent fishing as well.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It's only a puddle!

Mr. Evans: In 1956 the county of Simcoe had no crest, but the families of Simcoe and Gwillim had crests. So I combined the two crests together and presented a very interesting design to the county council, which it accepted. It was very interesting to note that on the Simcoe crest, it had these words in Latin: "Not for myself, but for my country." And that is the kind of a man that Lord Simcoe was.

We in Simcoe county have preserved much of our heritage in our museums and archives, of which the people of Simcoe are very proud. Much of the thanks goes to the Women's Institute which celebrated its 75th anniversary by having their president, Mrs. Howard Campbell, plant a tree on Sunday, May 14, which was yesterday. We also had the Solicitor General of the Province of Ontario (Mr. Yaremko), and he opened the second spring festival at that time. I know by talking to many residents of Simcoe county that they support Bill 25, an Act respecting Simcoe Day.

And I would just like to say: Is there any other place that you would sooner be? Certainly not; thanks to Lord Simcoe!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I didn't think that when this debate was called forth that it was going to turn out to be as interesting as it is. I sort of find myself in an invidious position of being in the crossfire between the hon. member for Simcoe East and the hon. member for York South, both of whom speak the truth.

Having researched the subject to a degree, I find what the hon. member for York South says isn't so far-fetched and that some of the things that he stated happened the way they did. When anybody complains about affairs being run by half-pay officers, I think about the investigation going on now regarding the Workmen's Compensation Board; and it seems to me that the province is still being run by half-pay officers now.

Anyway, in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, I think that our culture, our nation has to be based on people. Generally our history, the history of the nation—and we have done precious little about this sort of thing—has to be around human beings who have lived. Let's face it, our history is made up of dead people. Because when people are alive they are not immortalized; when they are alive they are vilified.

We all know the aphorism that some people are born to greatness, others achieve greatness, others have greatness thrust upon them. It is not until a man has passed from the scene that we consider him for historical enshrinement, and always within the context of the time and place in which he lived. I don't think it is fair, Mr. Speaker, to take a man who lived 200 years ago and apply our present-day standards to him, and say: "That man was a buccanneer;" "That man was a villain;" "That man was a blackguard." Within the time and the period in which he lived he was a man who made a contribution to this country; within that time and place and judged by those standards.

I want to correct the hon. member for York South when he, despite all of his research, called Simcoe a lord. Simcoe, John Graves Simcoe was never elevated to the peerage. I know this to be a fact because I remember when Jack Dodd built the hotel down here at York and King, in which I bought a bond for $1,000. I don't know what it is worth today. I thought it would see me through my old age; it doesn't seem to be worth much today.

I investigated the situation and found that John Graves Simcoe had not been elevated, if that is what you call it, to the peerage; and he was not a lord. Indeed, a few years ago when I was working for the city—I don't remember if it was in my mayoralty period or not—it was discovered that John Graves Simcoe's tomb was in the outskirts of London, England. I remember at that time an appeal was made to the provincial government for the purpose of exacting some money from the Department of Tourism and Information for the purpose of renovating and reconstituting and rebuilding the tomb of John Graves Simcoe near London, England, so that tourists could go over there and take a look at it.

So, in examining this man within the context of his times, we find that he was an imperial visionary to whom the loss of the American colonies had the force of a personal calamity. This was a disaster for him, as for many other United Empire Loyalists at the time. Simcoe brooded over the means by which the territory which remained could be turned to account for the restoration of the glory of the mother country and North America.

You want quotations? He certainly was not a liberal, in our sense of the term, either big "L" or small "l". He certainly wouldn't be considered a big Progressive Conservative by any means. He was typical of his day.

Simcoe held a notion, which prevailed in his generation, as regards education; his sole care was for the well-to-do—no question about it. It was part of the Family Compact, part of a deal which went on at that time. The children of the poorer classes might get such learning as befitted their station from their parents or other relations.

His views on the judiciary anticipated a controversy which excited the province 40 years later. None of the judges, except the chief justice should, in his opinion, hold seats in either the executive or the legislative council. He was right in this. Furthermore, he would discourage appeals from the provincial courts to the Privy Council as these might appear to the settlers from the United States as a badge of inconvenient subjection. He was right on that. It would have been a good thing if there never had been appeals to the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

He had this fixation about going down and getting some of the Yankees to come up here. History repeats itself. As the French say: "Plus çe change, plus c'est la même chose." He had this idea of inviting the Americans to come up here. He wanted to—am I right on that French? Thank you—build with them a greater Canada.

What was wrong with that? You read Pierre Berton's books, "The Last Spike" or "The National Dream", and you hear about scores of Americans who came up here to build this country and stayed here to be Canadians. Perhaps there are some of you sitting in this chamber—I'm not, but others may be—who are descendants of those very Yankees who came up here to live.

The hon. member for York South talks about the electors choosing as members of the assembly people who were perversely described as men who kept but one table, that is who dined in common with their servants. That is true. But the fact of the matter is that what the hon. member for Simcoe East said was true also, that he interfered with the slave trade.

If the Americans would have used as their acid test to greatness the fact of whether a man had slaves or not, where would George Washington be today? He had slaves. How interested was Abraham Lincoln really in the Emancipation Proclamation. He had certain motivations of his own, which I won't go into here. But Simcoe was against the importation of slaves. They were prohibited and the gradual extinction of the system was provided for in a stipulation that the children of slaves should be entitled to demand their freedom on attaining their 25th year.

So, in closing, I simply say this, Mr. Speaker, that it would appear from the examination of all the records—and it's a good thing we are not talking about Louis Riel today, if you looked at his record, and he is being championed in certain parts of the country today as a Canadian hero—when you examine this man's record, you find that no governor ever devoted himself more single-mindedly to the task entrusted to him. He strove to promote the well-being and prosperity of the settlers as zealously as if they were his own.

He spared himself in no way whatever. He travelled over the whole inhabited portion of the province, in large part on snowshoes. He and Mrs. Simcoe spent a winter during the first settlement of York in a canvas tent. Imagine spending a week in Toronto in a canvas tent in those days. Some people think it is bad enough now at the Royal York Hotel.

To break a monopoly of merchants whom he conceived to be dealing oppressively with the settlers in the disposal of their wheat, he fought a long battle with Lord Dorchester and the commissariat in Quebec.

Some of his ideas for the advancement of the colony appeared visionary but they were the product of a noble mind. I really see nothing wrong in this bill. If we are going to look for perfection, if we are going to expect saint-like behaviour on the part of men who built our country two centuries ago by applying to them the more liberalized, the smaller liberalized standards of today, we wouldn't name anything, any holiday or any institution or any part of our province after men, if we applied that kind of litmus paper test; and I don't think that we should.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the bill that is before us for the reasons I have indicated. I hope that this Legislature will enact the measure that was brought in by the hon. member for Simcoe East.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill put forward by the hon. member for Simcoe East. The city of Toronto and the city of Hamilton and a number of other municipalities throughout Ontario have declared the civic holiday as Simcoe Day.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from York-Forest Hill, with whom I have served in the past, remembers as I do a trip taken by city of Toronto aldermen to England back in 1962. He visited the little town of Honiton in Devon where Wolford Chapel is situated. There he found the last resting place of

Governor Simcoe and his wife. This place was in a state of disrepair. On coming back to the city of Toronto at that time a motion was brought forward in Toronto city council as a first step in having something done to the birthplace of a great person. The government of this province later took up what was put forward as a challenge and Wolford Chapel in Devon is now a place of which the people of Ontario may well be proud.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from the Spring 1968 issue of The Loyalist Gazette, in which they trace rather briefly the career of John Graves Simcoe, first governor of Upper Canada. I read, Mr. Speaker, from an article by A. G. Dorland, Ph.D., F.R.S.C. I quote as follows:

> Governor Simcoe will always have a special place in the regard of United Empire Loyalists because of his staunch support of the Loyalist cause from its beginning. At the outbreak of the American revolutionary war Simcoe was first engaged in active service as a junior officer in the British Army and was severely wounded at Brandywine, one of the early battles of the war. Later he was promoted for bravery, to the rank of Lt.-Col., and placed in command of a corps of "irregulars"—the Queen's Rangers. The men who made up his command were American colonists who remained loyal to the British Crown and had volunteered to help save the American colonies for the empire. Simcoe's connection with this famous Loyalist corps and with many of the civilian colonists who disapproved of the revolution, gave him a deep respect for the Loyalists. In fact, this experience coloured his whole future outlook and policy—in a contempt for everything republican and an abiding devotion to the British connection, and to those Loyalists who supported it.
>
> Upon the passing of the Constitutional Act of 1791, which divided the former province of Quebec into Upper and Lower Canada, Simcoe was appointed the first Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada. His proven ability as a leader and his close connection with the Loyalist cause made him the logical person for this position, which he assumed with characteristic enthusiasm. As Lieutenant Governor of the new province of Upper Canada, Simcoe's principal aim was to make a secure home for the Loyalists and to maintain at all costs the British connection and traditions of government. Simcoe held his first parliament at Newark, the present Niagara, with as much pomp of the old country as he could muster in the backwoods of Canada. In his address from the Throne as representative of the Crown, Simcoe assured the members that the Parliament there assembled represented "the very image and transcript of the British constitution." This was a very small beginning under somewhat inauspicious circumstances, but history was to vindicate Simcoe's faith. To ensure the safety of his infant province, Simcoe established Fort York as "a natural arsenal" for its protection and he embarked on a programme of road building. Two important roads were constructed. One, named Dundas St. after the British Secretary of State, extended from Burlington Bay to London on the Thames River. At first Simcoe wished to make London the capital of Upper Canada, but later it was transferred to York—Toronto. A second road connected York and Lake Simcoe. It was named Yonge St. in honour of the British Secretary of War. These roads would serve a dual purpose. They would facilitate the transport of troops and supplies in the event of war, and they would also open up the country to future settlement—another of Simcoe's main preoccupations.
>
> Though Simcoe served in Upper Canada for only about five years, he accomplished a great deal in a comparatively short time. He travelled incessantly throughout the province, attending conferences with the Indian Loyalists under their great chief—Joseph Brant—choosing and naming townsites, listening to the grievances of settlers, and continually trying to impress upon the home government the importance of Upper Canada in the future development of British North America.
>
> In 1796, Simcoe returned to England and was rewarded for his service to the empire by promotion to the rank of Lieutenant-General in the British Army. In 1806 he was named Commander-in-Chief for India, but before he could take over this new post, Governor Simcoe died at Wolford Lodge and was buried in a small chapel which he had built a few years before on the estate. Wolford Lodge and Estate are situated a few miles from the city of Exeter in Devonshire.
>
> In 1966, Sir Geoffrey Harmsworth, whose family had owned the chapel for the past 40 years, presented a deed of ownership to the provincial Premier, Mr. Robarts, on behalf of the Government of the Province of Ontario. The John Graves Simcoe

Memorial Foundation was created to administer this trust and to ensure that Wolford Chapel will never fall into neglect and will always be open to visitors from Canada and elsewhere.

To people of Ontario "the chapel is an historic shrine, a lasting reminder that much of our Canadian heritage is owed to the courage and devotion of people from other lands.'

Mr. Speaker, we owe a great deal to those pioneers of Ontario who came here 200 years or so ago and helped to lay the foundations for a great province. I quote part of an editorial from the same magazine:

But quite apart from patriotism and duty, let us be proud of our ancestors and their achievements for their own sake. There can be a great personal satisfaction in being involved, however remotely, with events of great significance. It is very gratifying to stand for something worthwhile; and unless one stands for something one is likely to fall for anything. In other countries children are taught to be patriotic and intensely proud of their country and their heritage. They are taught to revere their national heroes and to draw moral lessons from their deeds and their lives. So should we, lest the contribution of the Loyalists of Canada becomes dim and obscure. Of all Canadians, we are the ones who should know about it; we are the ones who should be most proud of it; we are the ones who should welcome opportunities to talk about it. Let's cast off our traditional reserve and speak out whenever we have a chance.

Mr. Speaker, I read from the—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's allotted time has expired. The hon. member for Hamilton West.

Mr. J. McNie (Hamilton West): I am very pleased to speak in support of this resolution—even though the gentleman we are honouring may have been less than perfect—I think he probably proved that when he passed Hamilton up as the capital! The story is told, apparently, that Hamilton was being very seriously entertained as the site of the capital, but because of some pressure from a real estate operator, Governor Simcoe passed us up—which was a sad mistake.

There were a number of things which he did which I think were important. And most of all I think we have to thank him for building roads, even though the hon. member for York South says they may not have been going anywhere. This is the way this country was developed, by building roads and railroads to places that some people didn't think were going anywhere.

He drained swamps, he brought in people. One road in particular was the road that was built between Dundas and Woodstock, a famous road called the Governor's Road, which proved a tremendous asset to the development, not only of a strong military base but also trade and commerce.

I have no hesitancy, Mr. Speaker, in recognizing the importance of this man's contribution as a man of action, a man of enthusiasm, a man of practical ideas and vision. Notwithstanding his imperfections, we, I think, have an obligation to seriously entertain this motion and to ask the government to make our present Civic Day, Simcoe Day, which would be far more appropriate to our times and our history. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: This completes the private members' hour.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate. However, that is not why I rose. I would like to call item No. 26, supply.

Clerk of the House: The 26th order, House in committee of Supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: It being 6 of the clock I do now leave the chair and we will resume at eight.

It being 6 of the clock, the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 15th, 1972

Position of denturists, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Renwick 2399

Medicare administration, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2400

Plea bargaining in Ontario courts, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2401

Health services insurance, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 2401

Safety standards for major appliances, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Lewis 2401

Drug substitution, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 2402

Bill 77, re municipal elections, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 2402

Home improvement programme, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. MacDonald 2402

Judge's statement in Windsor, question of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Bounsall 2403

Delay in court proceedings, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Ruston 2403

Offtrack betting, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Good 2404

Delay in exhumation, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Shulman 2404

New Toronto airport, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deacon 2405

Stock exchange commission rates, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Renwick 2405

Implementation of daycare legislation, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. R. S. Smith 2405

Niagara area farming operations, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. MacDonald 2406

Distribution of circulars to Ontario teachers, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. R. F. Nixon 2406

Repair service bureau, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. B. Newman 2407

Ottawa-Carleton municipal amalgamation, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deacon 2407

Provincial enumeration for assessment purposes, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Burr 2407

Government buildings in Thunder Bay, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Foulds 2407

Use of assessment computer tapes, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Good 2408

Death of prisoner in Hamilton jail, question of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. J. R. Smith 2408

Ministry of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, first reading 2409

Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, first reading 2409

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, first reading 2409

Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, first reading 2409

Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, first reading 2409

Riding Horse Establishments Act, bill to regulate, Mr. Stewart, first reading 2410

Dead Animal Disposal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 2410

Landlord and Tenant Act, bill to amend, Mr. Lawlor, first reading 2410

Estimates, Ministry of Health, Mr. Potter 2411

Private members' hour 2431

Simcoe Day Act, bill respecting, on second reading, Mr. G. E. Smith, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Evans, Mr. Givens, Mr. Wardle, Mr. McNie 2431

Recess, 6 o'clock 2441

No. 62

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, May 15, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: When we rose at 6 o'clock I believe the hon. minister was in the midst of a reply. The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I think when we ended up at 5 o'clock we were talking about nursing home beds and the fact that we hoped this would help us to reduce the number of active treatment beds in the province. Certainly, if our programme is going to be effective, and if we are going to be able to extend it and provide more services and improved facilities then we are going to have to find more economical ways of providing these facilities. This is one of the reasons we have been exploring other types of accommodation.

In providing the nursing home beds we find that we are able to discharge patients from hospital who have been occupying these beds—sometimes for many months—not because they needed the kind of care they could get in these hospital beds but because there was nowhere else for them to go. In many cases, while there might be some place for them to go, they were reluctant to pay or weren't able to pay the money that was necessary to locate them there. For one reason or another, they were kept in the active treatment hospitals.

A question was raised regarding the Peat Marwick report. It is true the nursing homes have been reluctant to supply figures to the department but they did agree to have a limited number of figures given to Peat Marwick who would analyse them and provide the facts for us. It was on the basis of these figures that a determination was made that the rate of $12.50 per day would be reasonable for 1972. The base rate of $12.50 is augmented by the rates of $3 for semi-private and $6 for private accommodation, making it $15.50 and $18.50 in total. In addition to that, the costs of drugs are paid by the insurance programme. These figures were submitted by Peat Marwick toward the end of 1971, I understand.

I think I should also point out that while there has been quite a bit of discussion by some of the nursing home operators today about the difficulties they have operating under this programme, the majority of them—at least the majority I have been talking to anyway—feel that they can do very well on it. I have—I don't know how many, I haven't counted them all—a number of applications which have come in from other people who want to get in the nursing home business, thoroughly understanding what the rates are. They have produced evidence for me—auditors' statements and other types of evidence—showing that they can make a good return on their investment at $12.50 a day. I think we should bear this in mind. There are still some nursing home operators who want to make a killing fast but, believe me, they are not going to make it at the expense of the taxpayers as far as the health programme is concerned.

Detoxification centres: Again when this programme was introduced, our policy, because of limited funds, was to establish detoxification centres in the centres where the need is greatest. We picked areas where they had over 1,000 arrests of this nature last year. At the same time we are encouraging all hospitals, and we will give them all the support we can to make arrangements within the hospitals themselves for some type of setup where they can treat these acute cases of alcoholism rather than have them thrown in the jail. If your particular area hasn't got a detoxification centre, we will have arrangements made with the hospitals so that they can be taken there.

I think it is also a case of educating the police. They pick up a fellow who has imbibed a bit too much and, in some areas of the province they already do it, they take him home. In many cases they could take them home rather than taking them to the cooler or even taking them to the hospital for detoxification.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Do they do that in Belleville?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, they don't but I wish they would because I would feel a hell of a lot safer if they did! The thing I want to point out is that these detoxification centres in themselves are not the whole answer. We must have a follow-up which we are planning and developing. If we're just going to take them in and dry them out, and let them out tomorrow, then they're going to go out tomorrow night and get drunk all over again.

I'm sure some of you are aware of the farm we have up at Elora where we have now for several years been treating the really chronic alcoholic who has reached the lowest ebb, really. I've been back there. I have spent an evening with them and I'm really quite pleased with the job they're doing there.

When you talk to some of these fellows and see what they've gone through, it's almost unbelievable. Granted, the percentage of the ones we save isn't that great at the present time, but it's coming up all the time and even if we save one in 10, it's pretty damn good, you know.

So that, as these things are set up we will have facilities to follow them up, to see that they're properly sort of a halfway house type —I don't like to use that term, but some type of facility in which we can follow up their treatment to stop them from getting back into the old habits again.

I think, as most you know with alcoholics, one sometimes wonders if you ever cure them. It depends—some of them have been off it for years and then something happens —some emotional strain of some sort—and away they go again. But it's one of the problems we're faced with in this day and age and we must be prepared to deal with it.

Parcost: To be quite honest with you I wasn't too sold on it when it first came in. They're trying to sell me now. I've still got an open mind and I'm ready to be convinced. Certainly I think the last book they put out is the best one they've done so far. It's got good comparative prices.

I think the pharmacists, perhaps, use it more than the physicians. Somehow I'm going to see if I can have a survey done to see how many physicians actually do use it.

One of the things Parcost is doing—they were doing it at the OMA convention and they'll be doing it at the CMA, too—is to demonstrate to the physicians how, with a small card, all they have to do is go through it and check off the prices—the cheapest prices particularly. They can carry the card around in their pockets, which is a lot easier than having to refer to the book all the time.

We have heard about the Green Shield plan and drug insurance. I haven't talked to the people at Green Shield now in a year, but the last time I was talking to them they were losing money and they weren't too optimistic about it. Their response was the same as was found in Great Britain and the same as we've had with our ordinary health insurance programme—that is the abuse given to this type of thing by the public generally. How you can get around this I don't know.

I'm still as concerned as you are that we must have—if we're going to have a total health care programme—drugs available to the patients when they need them, just the same as dental care is available. But, again, we have to make sure it's done in such a manner that it's not going to put us into bankruptcy. And we have to make sure we have the funds to pay for it in the first place. It has to come eventually and I'm meeting with the pharmaceutical people fairly regularly—but I'm particularly interested in the Green Shield people, because they have more information on this, I think, than probably anybody in Canada today. And they're prepared to make their information available to us.

Drug substitutes are another matter I'm ready to be convinced about. I know that both the OMA and the Ontario College of Pharmacy have recommended we allow drug substitution. I want to be convinced in my own mind that it is, in fact, in the best interests of the public; that there aren't any niggers in the woodpile, so to speak, we don't know of at this time.

I want to make sure it is in the best interests of the public before we bring it in. You're shaking your head—maybe you know more about it, but I sure don't—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am shaking my head about your unfortunate choice of language.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't know all the details about it. Maybe you do.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well—

Hon. Mr. Potter: If you do, I wish you'd tell us about it, because—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'll tell you about it some time.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): It has been around for a long time.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I'm afraid I must disagree with the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta), concerning his opinion of physicians in the Province of Ontario. I think we're very, very fortunate with the high calibre of the people we have in the province and the standard of care that we have in the province.

Just a week ago I met with an executive of one of our labour unions who assured me that what they were trying to convince us about in Ontario by bringing Americans in was really something that we shouldn't consider—that they felt that Ontario was far ahead of the United States as far as health programmes were concerned and that we didn't need their assistance. I have a tendency to agree with them. I think we are far ahead of the United States as far as our health programme is concerned. I am willing—I am anxious as a matter of fact—to study programmes anywhere in the world to see if they might have anything to offer that would be of assistance to us. We are doing that now and we will continue to do that.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2301. Is it wished that we do this item by item? Item number one is main office.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): It is agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

On vote 2301:

Mr. Paterson: I would like to thank the minister for replying to most of the questions I posed earlier this afternoon, and his explanations of the various programmes. There are two or three items in this first vote that I would like to ask of the minister. I note that salaries and wages in the main office have more than doubled from the past year, and I just wonder what the reason for that is. Has there been an increase in the personnel or increased wages? What is going on? Is this shuffling of personnel within the department itself?

Secondly, under the main office the minister can possibly at the same time give the House some explanation as to what level of civil servant has his moving charges paid for. I noticed an explanation of this on page 316 of the estimates, but just what ranking in your department gets this particular benefit for movement? I will await the minister's reply.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Most of the increased salaries and wages relate to the increased staff we brought in to develop the Parcost programme. I haven't got the information on the moving of staff, but I will get that for you.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the Parcost programme and the minister's statements in regard to choice of drugs by the pharmacist under that programme. When the Parcost programme was first put into effect about two years ago—the present Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) was the minister then—we had a long discussion on this in the committee and I indicated then that my views were somewhat the same as the minister's are now. I didn't think the programme was going to be very effective unless the minister was prepared to go to the point where he would bring in legislation to allow the pharmacist to have the choice of dispensing whatever drug was the most economical on the drug index.

At that time the Minister of Health said how great the programme was and how it was going to work, but, in effect, it really hasn't done too much to lower the price of drugs to the people in the province.

Then we had a new minister, the present Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), and last fall he indicated that he was going to bring in legislation to allow the pharmacist the right of choice of the drug on the index. I think all the people concerned were relieved that finally all the money spent in developing the Parcost programme might have been worth while.

Now again, we have another new minister and he indicates that he is not too sure he is going to take that step. I would suggest to the minister that either he does away with the Parcost programme or he takes that next step to make it work. It has been apparent right from the start that the programme was useless unless that step was taken. I think that after three years there should be some way of arriving at a decision as to whether the money is going to be spent in a proper way so it will either effect the lowering of drug costs across the province or it won't. If the minister has come to the decision that he doesn't want to take that next step then I think the programme has been useless and a lot of money has been put down the drain for nothing.

There are other alternatives as well. I notice that both Manitoba and Saskatchewan are moving into a programme by which there is going to be central purchasing of drugs and then they will be distributed to the hospitals and the pharmacies across the

province. This may well produce a lowering in the cost of drugs at the retail level to the people concerned, but on the other hand once the government gets into the administration of such a programme, I think that after a year or two the costs would be back up where they were before. Of course there they wouldn't have the quality control that the CBI gives, a guarantee — some people don't like to call it a guarantee of drug quality control but as far as I am concerned, it is a guarantee of drug quality control.

I think that there could be some abuses in a system such as that. I would suggest to the minister if the Parcost programme is going to be worthwhile, that he must take the next step. Since the Ontario Medical Association as well as the pharmacists' association have accepted the principle that legislation could be brought forward to give the pharmacist the right to make the choice on the basis of the CBI, then I think it is up to the minister to move. I don't think we can wait much longer in spending money on a programme that will work if it is given this added impetus.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's perfectly right, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I wonder if the House would accept my apologies in my choice of words a few minutes ago. I am afraid it was a very poor choice of words when I was speaking and would ask that it be stricken from the record.

As far as Parcost is concerned, at the present time the curve index shows that the costs are generally lower than they were before. I don't want anybody to get the idea for one minute that I am saying that I don't want to bring it in. I just want to be convinced. I wasn't well enough versed, as I told you, with the programme as it was being operated and I want to be convinced that it is in the best interests of the public that this be done. They have got the information for me and I can assure you, with the staff I have got, they are damn well going to convince me if they possibly can. I'll have this all settled for you within a matter of the next week or two. I don't think you need to worry about that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: In other words, what you are saying is that if you decide not to bring in the legislation that will give the pharmacists that, then you are going to do something else with Parcost—do away with it or—

Hon. Mr. Potter: We will have it settled.

Mr. R. S. Smith: It will be settled one way or the other in the next week or two?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, we have agreed to handle vote 2301 item by item. The first item however is worth $57,709,000 and contains a number of very important programmes indeed. I would suggest to the minister if he is in this portfolio next year—and Ministers of Health do seem to change rather rapidly—that he might ask the Management Board to arrange the estimates in a little more convenient manner.

For example, among the programmes listed in the first item is included something called "Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation, $7,408,000." I thought we had changed the name of that organization by Act of Legislature a couple of years ago to "Addiction Research Foundation." Not that that's particularly important, but this is a matter of policy where I would expect the minister to be prepared to make a statement.

As he knows, one of his colleagues in the Conservative Party, a newly elected member for Humber (Mr. Leluk), made some very serious charges about the ARF in his maiden speech here in the chamber. He indicated that he, as a pharmacist himself, and as a member of an organization which was designed to assist the community in coping with the drug problem and the illicit use of drugs, had something less than full confidence in the ARF programme and the personnel employed there. My experience on an unprofessional basis has been quite the contrary.

I think year-by-year as the appropriation for the Addiction Research Foundation has gone up there have been speeches on all sides of considerable commendation for the head of the ARF and the work that they are doing.

It may have been that politicians on all sides knew of nothing else to do but pump a lot of money into the organization hoping that through their research and through the experiments that they were carrying on, some solution or at least some inkling of a solution would come to light.

For example, the experiments that the Addiction Research Foundation has carried out with the use of marijuana under controlled conditions have led many jurisdictions. Most jurisdictions have been scared silly to experiment with marijuana.

The idea that the government itself would

purchase the stuff and give it to people who were volunteering their services under controlled conditions certainly frightened off other jurisdictions. I remember that one of this minister's predecessors refused to allow ARF to undertake these experiments at first.

I can't recall the specific quote of the Hon. Mr. Wells, who was then minister, but certainly he wasn't going to allow an emanation of this government to have marijuana in controlled experimental conditions on the premises or to be associated with it in any way. I'm glad to see that position has been reversed.

Also, the Addiction Research Foundation prepared an elaborate paper, sort of a critique, on the recommendations of the LeDain reports up to the final one, or the most recent one available. They were quite critical of some of the recommendations, one criticism being that they felt the LeDain studies had been amateurish—I think that word was in fact used—and that the LeDain commission had not been fulfilling the very far-reaching needs of the community in getting expert information and recommendations in this whole matter of the non-medical use of drugs.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal to be said of this. My own grassroots feeling is that we are over the hump in the non-medical use of drugs. I may be just naive and optimistic but from what I can gather in talking to as many people as I can, it doesn't seem to be quite the exciting, mysterious attraction to young people that it was maybe three or four years ago.

I think that a certain degree of sanity in the adolescent grapevine, if one exists, is starting to come out to the individuals themselves.

There is no doubt that the illegal use of drugs is still a menace in every community in this province, and there are no politicians that I know of who have any reasonable answers. But we hear some rare birds say that the law should be changed so that the full weight of the condemnation of the community is not going to fall on every adolescent who is caught in the possession of some marijuana, and perhaps the other extreme which of course is to suggest putting them all into jail and subjecting them to the lash. It is difficult to find a moderate, temperate, reasonable, alternative line.

That is why we have had, in the past, so much confidence in the minister and his predecessors' recommendations for large appropriations to ARF. I personally have felt the staff of the foundation in their public utterances and their willingness to take rather important initiatives deserve a great deal of credit.

I think the minister has a responsibility to answer the charges that have been leveled in this house by the member for Humber (Mr. Leluk) and to indicate just what he, as minister responsible, feels the course of action resulting in certain researches at ARF should lead him, as the minister, to recommend to us as members, and also to his colleagues in the government.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, perhaps before I get into that question, the question was asked about moving expenses, and 100 per cent of moving expenses are paid for those who are moved on duty assignment cases or those who are successful in an internal competition. Allowable items are stipulated under Management Board rules, up to 80 per cent for new appointees. If this kind of help is indicated to secure well-qualified staff, assistance is not limited to class but is available to all those who qualify for a specific job.

Now to get back to this addiction research. Anyone who, I am sure most of you will realize, is involved in this type of research in this day and age, is going to be open to criticism. It doesn't matter what you do in the drug field as far as research is concerned, you are going to be criticized.

In the last several weeks I've been around the province, I've seen one or two drop-in centres that I thought were pretty top-notch centres and were well administered. In one or two we were assisting local municipalities, one in particular at Sault Ste. Marie. They are really doing a terrific job up there in co-operation with the public and so on.

But even there, under those circumstances, with what we would consider an A-1 situation, there was a lot of criticism, people accusing the operators and the board that was operating it of leading their sons and daughters astray, and so on.

I don't think you can ever get away from this type of thing. By the same token, as I have said before, all of us are entitled to our own opinions. I am one of those people who, after careful examination of the records and going into reports, thinks that we should be very proud of our ARF in this province. No matter where you go in the world, it is well known. The World Health Organization of the United Nations comes to our Addiction Research Foundation for advice.

And just this past week I got copies of letters, one to Dr. Kalant and one to Dr. Popham. Perhaps I can read one to you:

> I am writing on behalf of the board of directors of the E. M. Jelinek memorial fund.

This comes from the World Health Organization at Lausanne.

> It is a great pleasure to inform you of the decision to make the next E. M. Jelinek memorial award to you and to Dr. Kalant. In proposing that this third E. M. Jelinek award should be presented to you both, we wish to recognize your outstanding scientific contribution to the study of the problems of alcohol.
>
> By making this joint award we also wish to give recognition to the multi-disciplinary research programme of the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario and the leadership it has given to alcohol studies the world over. We are arranging for the presentation to be made—

and so on and so on.

So I'm afraid I can't agree with all the criticism we hear. I think we are getting good value for our money. I think that they should be commended on the research they are doing, that they have done in the past and that they are continuing to do.

No matter what they do, they are going to be criticized. No matter what any of us does, we are going to be criticized. But I think it is a very worthwhile project and I am very happy to be able to commend them for it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the minister would just dwell on that for a moment. Obviously when a member of this House gets up and, in a formal debate with what he would think, I suppose, is some documentation, is specifically critical of the organization and decisions made by it, I don't think it's sufficient that the Minister of Health simply compare that with main street gossip in Sault Ste. Marie, having to do with a drop-in centre.

It is true that criticism is always with us, and as politicians we are certainly aware of that, but this is something other than just criticism.

This is a person who is a professional pharmacist himself and a leader in a community group dealing with drugs. And I think it should be, at this stage, incumbent upon the minister to specifically reject the charges that Mr. Leluk made or, on the other hand — well, I would hope that he would reject them, but there are, of course, alternatives.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I have asked the hon. member who made the charges to let me have some of the details. He is doing this, and I will be delighted to check them out, but until I can find any specific evidence to back up the charges that were made, I would have no alternative but to reject them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, there is a unique project going on in the northeast whereby the Addiction Research Foundation in conjunction with the Monteith Industrial Farm, I guess it is, has men come down from the institution and take a six-to-eight-week course at the Northeastern Regional Mental Health Centre and it's a period of group therapy, group discussion and so on. This has been going on now for a couple of years and I've had the privilege of attending several of the sessions. I must say that I'm very impressed with the kind of work that's going on there and the rapport that develops between the men and the members of the ARF staff.

I know one of the young fellows who went through the programme has since gone into Northern College in the social services course and will be graduating in a year. He will be doing, I think, quite a bit of work in this whole field in the future.

When I was there just before Christmas I knew that an evaluation of this programme was being undertaken by the ARF, I believe, in Toronto. They had a special researcher working on this to evaluate the results that had taken place. I would hope that perhaps by now the evaluation is complete and the minister might be in a position to say whether the results are such that this programme could not only be continued at this institution in the northeast, but be adopted in a number of the other correctional institutions throughout the province in conjunction with the ARF.

I think that this is of equal or greater value perhaps than a detoxification centre which just looks after a man on a 24-hour basis. I think this programme can help a lot of men back to their place in the community; help them understand themselves and why they have been drinking; and perhaps they would be less inclined to go back into that kind of approach in the future. As you

mentioned—you said you hesitated to call it a halfway house—some kind of home in the community which could help men adjust themselves to the community, I think would have a very rehabilitative approach, not only from the correctional point of view but also from the alcohol or the drug problem that may have gotten them in the institution in the first place.

So I wonder if the minister could tell us if he has evaluated that programme and if the results are such that he feels it can be greatly expanded throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, the programme is a a co-operative programme between the industrial farm, Northeastern Psychiatric Hospital and ARF. It is not finished yet. It will be finished probably in six months' time. But the results so far would indicate that it is being most successful and it will be expanded to other parts of the province. It will probably be October or November before the final report on it. I will then table it in the House.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, would this be an appropriate place to ask about smoking? What is being done to—

Mr. Chairman: I would think so. Does the hon. minister agree with that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Smoking?

Mr. Burr: Cigarettes.

Mr. Chairman: We will hear the hon. member.

Mr. Burr: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: There is probably nothing in the estimates for that, but—

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is nothing in the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: It's general policy.

Mr. Burr: Yes. Well, I would like to ask the minister whether he has any plans to help in the campaign against smoking.

I came across an issue of the Canadian Weekly of 1963, which said "Lung Cancer Is Now Epidemic." It is about the time when the issue became really public for the first time. In fact it says—I won't read very much of this—that the Canadian Medical Association broke its 30-year tradition of silence and called its first press conference at the time of the Toronto meeting, and goes on to say that:

> This committee of 17 doctors have decided unanimously that there is only one way to reduce this terrible wastage of human life, and that is by an all out nation-wide drive to tell people about the hazards of cigarette smoking. Our first aim must be to reach the young people. Each day it has been estimated [And this is back in 1963.] 450 boys and girls in Canada, aged 11 to 17 years, start smoking; and once children start it takes only two years for the habit to get a hold. One way to influence them, believes the CMA president, is by adult and parental example. He recently wrote a letter to all Canadian doctors urging that if they were not able to do without he habit at least they should never smoke in their offices or in hospitals.

The article goes on to talk about the $150-million-a-year advertising campaign to persuade people to smoke; and a little paragraph says:

> If money counts and the tobacco companies win, cigarette smoking will eventually be responsible for the premature deaths of 100,000 children now attending Canadian schools.

I would just like to ask the minister what the plans are for helping in the campaign to persuade people, especially the children, to avoid this habit

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, at the present time the whole programme is a federally sponsored programme. This is one of the matters, along with many other problems we have, I hope to have an opportunity to discuss with the federal Minister of Health as soon as we can get together to see how we can be of some assistance to them in promoting the programme.

Mr. Burr: There is nothing done independently?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I am not—

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that without spending any money at all, the Minister of Health could do a great deal if he went on television from time to time with some carefully thought-out presentations and perhaps talked to parents. I think one way of helping the situation among the adults would be to remind them that studies show that in homes where one adult is a smoker, the chil-

dren have a much poorer attendance record at school. And that the amount of respiratory troubles among children in homes of smokers is twice that as compared with the homes of non-smokers. I think every aspect of psychology must be used. Where a man or a woman may not think too much about his own health saying, "It is my funeral"—that attitude—by appealing to them on the effect on the children's health as well as the example they set, a great deal could be accomplished.

Hon. Mr. Potter: In my experience of 30 years as a physician, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I've never been very successful in trying to convince any smoker who was really interested in smoking that it was going to harm his health, or his children's health, or anybody else's. I do think it is something that we have to approach from the educational standpoint. There are some people you are never going to convince. By the same token, I don't want to duplicate something the federal people are doing, and I think we should work closely together on it.

Mr. Burr: The one group among whom there has been a great deal of success in cutting down on smoking is the doctors. I've seen the figure that 70 per cent of doctors do not now smoke. The reason is that they have been frightened by their personal experiences—people with whom they have come in contact; their trips to hospitals. It seems to me that with a little careful thought the reasons for success with some people can be discovered and applied to the other people. Well, we'll let this part go about what you are doing for the smokers. What I would like to know is, are you planning to do anything for the non-smokers? Are you planning to protect the non-smokers in any way?

For example, on trains there used to be a section reserved for smokers and one for non-smokers. This was in the days when there was no proof that it was anything more than a nuisance to people. But now that we know the dangers and the fact that non-smokers can suffer from the effects of other people's smoke—to a lesser degree probably—there is no protection on a train any more at all. In fact, about the only notice you see in a train is a sign saying "Cigarette Smoking Permitted." In other words, it's encouraged. People who might not otherwise smoke on a train, see this sign and they say "Well, it's perfectly all right here."

In the Toronto subways, smoking is not allowed. In the last four years I've seen two smokers attempt to smoke and both times the conductor, over the loudspeaker system, immediately asked them to put their cigarettes out. Everybody takes it for granted that smoking just isn't done in the subway. Have you any plans for extending public protection for non-smokers?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, at the present time the Canadian Cancer Society and other groups that are interested—the Addiction Research Foundation has been serving on committees with them to get into this matter and see what can be done—both the foundation and the Canadian Cancer Society have made representation to the federal government, suggesting that they do ban cigarette advertising. They're also making recommendations as you suggested, concerning transportation in trains and airplanes. This could also be extended to buses and GO trains and this sort of thing.

At the present time there hasn't been any definite action taken. This committee of representatives of the Canadian Cancer Society and other interested people is meeting regularly with them, trying to come up with some suggestions and some ideas as to how this can be handled.

Mr. Burr: Just one final remark, Mr. Chairman, I also have here one of the comic books that were used back in the early days. Of course these go out of date fairly rapidly. Here are Carl Brewer and Harry Jerome and Bill Crothers—perhaps you should reissue this or have the people who issued this in the first place reissue it. This is a Canadian Cancer Society publication. Bring it up to date with the names of athletes that the young children know better.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On the various reports of the Addiction Research Foundation, in their comments about LeDain, in their reports on the use of marijuana through their own research, which came under fire from the hon. member for Humber particularly, I think that there is a good deal can be done as a matter of government policy, without going out on any impossible limbs, so that the findings of the ARF are reasonably well known by the people who are concerned. If one of the functions of the ARF is to educate the populace, the people who pay its bills, then the people must not only have ready access to what its findings and recommendations are. It's the minister's responsibility, in

my view, to see that these findings and recommendations are circulated and pushed a little bit.

We're not particularly concerned with the hard drugs like heroin at this level of government. There's absolutely general agreement that everything that can be done to administer and enforce the Criminal Code, as far as heroin and these terrible addictive drugs are concerned, should be done. I doubt very much if ARF does any research on that, but maybe it does. We've been hearing from the federal level about methadone treatments—things like that—but that seems to be their jurisdiction.

Then, at the other end, the problems of marijuana have probably been dealt with by ARF more directly than any other jurisdiction or any other research body that I am aware of, and I think the government deserves a great deal of credit for allowing them to undertake this rather risky business. Maybe 10 years from now we won't think it's very risky to do that sort of research, but the minister knows how sensitive the matter is in the community. If the minister has confidence in the results of those experiments, then we should know even more about them than we do from the report.

The member for Humber said, of course, it was just males over the age of 21 who were part of the experiment, they were all screened by psychiatrists so they didn't have the special pressures that other people in the community might be subjected to and therefore you couldn't say with any degree of fairness that marijuana did this or did not do that.

Maybe the experiment should be extended if it is unsatisfactory, if it won't stand the light of professional scrutiny. I can't see the sense in taking this important initiative and allowing it just to hang there. You don't have to start with any particular preformed connections; surely the scientists don't—and I trust that the politicians don't either.

There is one other area in the middle that does concern me, and that is the range of chemical stimulants and depressants and mood-changers that we read about quite a bit. I find there is something terribly depressing about the number of people who apparently have access to drugs that should be controlled by the federal statute and yet they can buy these on the streets so readily —barbiturates and amphetamines are the two names that come to mind.

It seems incredible, when these particular drugs normally are prepared by licensed pharmaceutical companies and encapsulated and so on under stringent control, that so many of them, even from those sources, evidently are available on the street. I suppose there is always some nut in a back room with a couple of condensers and a bunsen burner who can make anything he wants, including nitro-glycerine—and he doesn't need too much to do that—but the thing I find most offensive is that many of these drugs do not come from these back-room lab sources: apparently they come filtering down from the very best pharmaceutical sources into this illicit market. I have always been amazed that this happens. I can't for the life of me understand how these drugs get on to the illicit market in such large amounts.

I don't know whether the minister can enlighten me or indicate what could be done as far as enforcement procedures are concerned, but it seems to me if we want to get particularly excited and use the full strength of the law then we are talking about it in that particular area. I have a number of views on this matter, but I am sure there will be other occasions when we can discuss it. If the minister could enlighten me to some extent on how these drugs from legitimate sources get on the illegal market, I would be most interested to know.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would be delighted if I could. I don't think anybody on the North American continent has come up with a solution as to how you can control these things. I think the new legislation federally on amphetamines should have a significant effect in controlling the amphetamines—but that's only one.

To get back to publications, ARF produces 42 different publications and last year sent out over 4.1 million copies of these publications on request; so you can see what a wide distribution they have. In addition, they are starting a monthly publication, the first issue of which will be ready in about 10 days or two weeks; there will be between 50,000 and 70,000 copies of this going out to all the schools, all the professions and as many groups as we can on a regular basis, keeping them well informed on what's going on at the Research Foundation and keeping everybody up to date on their findings. I think this is what the member was referring to.

In addition, my own ministry's communications department is embarking on a public relations programme in which we have the co-operation not only of the Addiction Research Foundation but the cancer foundation, the Red Cross and the professional

groups such as the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the College of Dentistry, the College of Pharmacy, in which we are going to run programmes. And here hopefully too, we will be starting in June, using all of the news media to make the public aware not only of our research into this type of thing but what our public health programme in Ontario is, what type facilities we have, where they are, how they should be used, what happens when they abuse them, and this sort of thing.

So I think you will find that the public relations in all these programmes will be pretty well improved within the next short time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about the continuation of the marijuana experiments?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am told that this present programme is just finishing. The data is being analyzed now, and then the decision will be made about carrying on with further research.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, I would just like to ask one question further on this Drug Addiction Research Foundation. Is there any reason why officers of this foundation would hesitate to speak at outside groups, such as a service club? Is it their policy not to speak at community public meetings or should they be encouraged to do this?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Last year I understand they had between 5,000 and 6,000 speaking engagements at organizations such as you are talking about. Perhaps they just haven't been invited up your way. They respond to groups, to requests from many groups in the community—schools, service clubs, professional associations and so on—when they wish to obtain a resource person to assist them with a problem or to obtain information on by having a speaker at one of their functions.

They receive several thousand requests each year and many, many of them are fulfilled.

There are no restraints on them at all. As a matter of fact, they are a pretty active group. If you know of any areas where they would like to have speakers or any information, just let us know.

Mr. Ferrier: I will pursue it at the local level.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is a piece of information you might be interested in, actually, and this is fairly recent. It is that smoke from marijuana cigarettes contains 50 per cent more tar than ordinary tobacco smoke, and that marijuana when taken with alcohol will have a particularly pronounced effect on such things as driving motor vehicles.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You mean that it is going to be more of a cancer causer than tobacco?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is what it sounds like.

Mr. R. S. Smith: People will have to take the marijuana pledge.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Swear off now.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions I would like to ask in regard to the foundation.

First, I would like to say that as far as I am concerned, the work that the foundation has been doing is worthwhile and I believe that as a Legislature we should support the work they are doing in the community as well as in research, particularly in the area of that work which they carried out in regard to marijuana.

But I do feel that there is some change within the foundation. I don't think it is the desire of those who run the foundation but I think it is the result of restrictions that are being placed on them by the amounts of money provided by the ministry and by the government.

I would like the minister to tell me about that, insofar as the programmes that the foundation has developed within the community, the SEED programme that they have—I am not just sure of the particular name of it but I am sure the minister will recognize what I am speaking about—the support they have been giving through grants to different municipal or private organizations that have been developing new programmes, new ways to deal with drug abuse, such as the drop-in centre which the minister spoke of in Sault Ste. Marie a few minutes ago.

As I understand it, there has been a drastic reduction in the amounts of funds that are being made available to the foundation for this type of programme. I wonder if the minister would tell me how much money was available last year and how much is being made available this year?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Last year it was $340,000;

this year it is $305,000. And actually, the restrictions for the ARF were the same as for any other branch of the department. It was the same right across the board. They weren't treated any differently from anybody else.

Mr. R. S. Smith: In other words, there was an almost 15 per cent reduction in the amount of funds that were made available for this type of programme? From $340,000 down to $305,000? Well, I think that is a much bigger reduction than has taken place in most of the other departments of government. The fact of the matter is, as I understand it, there has been some increase in most departments.

But here we have a programme that has been established for a number of years, and certain commitments I think were made by the ARF to different organizations across the province before they had their approvals from the ministry and from the government as to the amounts of money that were going to be made available. I think that the innovative programmes that have been established across this province have certainly been worthwhile, both for the purposes that they specifically met at the community level, and as well for the information that has filtered back from them to the government itself.

Now, I would ask the minister why the reduction in that specific programme was much much higher, I think, than across the board; both within your department and within the other departments of government? I also note that as far as the amounts of money that are being made available for payments for control of drug abuse, that amount of money is reduced this year as well by some $50,000. Perhaps the minister could comment on this?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, of course, the director of ARF tells me that he had enough funds to fund every request that he thought should be funded; that altogether there were requests for over $800,000. We have funded a little over $300,000, but they thought they were the only ones which should have been funded.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is the minister telling me—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Even if we had $800,000, we wouldn't have used it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I am not saying there should be $800,000, but if there had been more funds available than the $305,000, would the ARF not have used them to fund specific programmes for which there had been requests?

Hon. Mr. Potter: In addition to the $305,000 here, there is another $175,000 in my estimates for payments to control drug abuse that is available for this source too; and we haven't used it all.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That has been reduced by $50,000 already.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is right.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I just pointed that out. In other words, there has been a $95,000 reduction this year, which amounts to better than a 20 per cent reduction in the estimated amount of money that is being provided. And am I right in saying that the minister has indicated to me that all the worthwhile projects that had made application were approved by the ARF and additional funds were not required?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Of the $225,000 we had last year, only $110,000 was spent; so now we have cut that down to $175,000 this year. We feel this is going to be ample to do what we want to do at this time.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I know of some who have made application and it was indicated to them that because of the restrictions on funds that were made available by the government, these programmes couldn't be funded. Now, if the ARF felt that these programmes weren't worthwhile, then they should have been told that they weren't worthwhile. But I don't think they should be told that the reason they weren't granted their funds was because of restrictions placed on the amount of money available.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I guess the member is talking about one in North Bay that—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Right, sure!

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, they got their grant.

Mr. R. S. Smith: No, I am not talking about the drop-in centre. They got their grant—I'll grant you that—a little less than perhaps they should have got, but they did get some. But there was the Crisis Centre which also made an application. They were advised that they weren't being considered because of the lack of funds that were available—not because their grant or their programme wasn't a good one.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well certainly I can't answer that now.

I can tell you quite frankly that you are going to hear from all kind of hospitals across the province saying, "We want more beds." I am saying, "I'm sorry, you are not going to have them until you can show us that you are using what you've got properly and there is no waste."

There is no way that we are going to be able to fill everybody's requests for grants, for grants-in-aid, for new facilities or anything else. We are going to do the best we can within the budget we have. But I think you'll agree with everybody else that we must have budget restrictions. We have a budget of over $2 billion. There is no way that we can spend as much money as everybody wants us to spend in each particular area.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I am not questioning that at all. I realize that you have budgetary restrictions but I'm just pointing out that within this programme there has been a reduction of some 20 per cent in the overall. This is a much bigger reduction than has taken place in any othe department of government and I feel that the grant-in-aid programmes that have been provided across the province have certainly proved to be worthwhile in most centres.

The government feels that this is the place where it can reduce, and at the same time it spends moneys in other places where there is much more waste—such as $38,000 offices for the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). Instead it should put the funds into programmes like this that have proved of benefit not only to the community generally but also to the young people who are involved with this problem.

I don't think that the control of drug abuse and the SEED programmes are any place for a government to look for reductions in expenditures at the present time. I think it is a major problem we have to face and the small amounts of money that are being expended in this programme certainly should not be cut.

To go to community people and say to them that they are not being granted money because money is not being made available to us apparently was not the proper reason. You are indicating to me that all the good and viable programmes that applied were supplied with some assistance. I say that if these programmes are not viable and are not good programmes then I think that people should be told, and not given some other story.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is no question of giving you some other story as far as I'm concerned. It is a question of priority of what is needed most. As far as these applications are concerned it is a question of what we decide are the ones that should be funded. There is no way, as I told you before, that we are going to be able to provide the funds that everybody wants. It is just impossible. I'm not interested in what happens in the other departments. I am interested in what happens in this department.

We have so much money to spend. We have to provide more and better services all over the province. We are going to do that. We are going to set our priorities. Sometimes we think one thing has a higher priority than another. When you can convince us that perhaps it hasn't, then we will change it. But this is something that is going to be an ongoing thing. There's no way we are going to say, "This is top priority today and it is going to stay there forever."

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well it is obvious that this programme has never been a top priority, and now it is a lesser priority—when the amount of funds that are available to it is reduced by 20 per cent. I just feel that it is the wrong place for a government to look to save money. I think it is despicable that a government will go along with a programme such as this to a point where it has proved itself as being viable in most communities and in most projects that have been funded by it, and then all of a sudden cut it off because they have a retrenchment and need to save a few tax dollars. I think that the moneys that are being saved in this regard are going to cost a lot more, both in regards to funds later on and the human suffering or the social disability that might take place, because of the few dollars that are being saved here.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: There is an organization called the Alcohol and Drug Concerns, I think it is, the present version of the former Temperance Federation. They have taken on a new image and a new name One of the things they do in their youth programme is to have a trailer that they bring to various parts of the province where youths are likely to congregate. I saw it last summer in Parry Sound. There has been an effort made to bring this up to northeastern Ontario for a while this summer to see how it would operate up there, because I think studies by

this foundation have shown that in the northeast, while the hard drugs are not used as plentifully as they are down here, marijuana and the others are used probably a little bit more. Is this organization left entirely to the churches and other people to fund or are there some grants through your programmes here?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They get a grant of $8,600.

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1, the member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Before the minister took office in this department, the report on hospital privileges was submitted to the previous minister (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) who at that time indicated that he wouldn't make any commitments on the implementation of this particular report, but did hint that some of the recommendations could be implemented through regulations.

I wonder if the minister under the terms of reference of policy could comment on two or three of these items at this time, such as one suggestion that caught my mind that doctors should be reexamined on their medical competence. Is this a philosophy or a policy matter that has been discussed by the present administration and the other several items that came under this matter? Can we discuss this here or did you want to wait until the third vote?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Sorry, is this to do with medical training? I missed the first part here.

Mr. Paterson: No, it is a policy statement that came into the department on the recommendation on hospital privileges. Since the policy minister for this department isn't here, but we do have the Minister of Health here, I thought under the first vote, which is the main office, that policy decisions were being arrived at in that department.

Mr. Chairman: That would be 2303.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I didn't know where it fitted in here; that was all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, well, that is policy.

Mr. Paterson: It is policy.

Mr. Chairman: I would think it would be more appropriate under 2303, would it not? Under hospital managment services. The member for North Bay.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Thunder Bay.

Mr. Chairman: Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, it is a north bay all right, but it is Thunder Bay.

Mr. Chairman: Sorry.

Mr. Stokes: I want to get into the deliverance of health services, particularly in northern Ontario. I imagine it comes under health resources development plan where you are spending either $46 million or $55 million.

I want to find out from the minister in some more specific detail than I have been able to find out in the past just what plans he has for the deliverance of health services in northern Ontario. I want to draw his attention to an article that appeared in the Medical Post late last year wherein it states:

> The federal health department has signed an agreement with six Canadian universities for a one-year pilot programme of enriched training for northern nurses. The programme, to be supported by $314-000 from federal coffers, is intended to provide northern nurses with additional expertise in diagnosis, physical assessment of patients and certain treatment procedures for use in situations when consultation might be available from a doctor by radio or, as often happens, even when such professional support is not available at the time.

I happen to have a fair knowledge of what goes on in many distant and isolated communities in northern Ontario under the jurisdiction of the Department of National Health and Welfare. I think the minister has been up there and has seen some of the clinical services that are available in communities, such as Fort Hope, Big Trout Lake and Lansdowne House, where they are staffed with very competent and very dedicated nurses. A good many of them have emigrated from the British Isles and their dedication to their work and the people in those remote communities is something to behold.

I will say that the Department of National Health and Welfare has gone out of its way to provide clinical services far beyond what is available in many communities much closer to the main stream of things even in places in my riding such as Nakina, Upsala, Armstrong and places like that which are either right along the main highways or main railways.

I wrote a letter to the minister a short while ago concerning this particular aspect of health services and enclosed the article, and I said to him in part:

> It seems ironical that the federal government is able to provide a much higher level of medical services in remote communities of the north than the provincial government is capable of providing in communities such as Nakina, Armstrong, Savant Lake, Upsala and Pickle Lake.
>
> People in these communities pay the same hospital and medical premiums as anyone in Ontario but have to drive hundreds of miles to take advantage of these services. They pay income tax, gasoline tax, licence fees and a higher percentage of sales tax, since this tax is based on the cost of consumer goods which is higher in these communities because of high transportation costs and distances from the main centres of distribution.

So the minister can see that these people are taking a beating both ways.

> Proportionately a much higher percentage of their earnings is used to subsidize hospital, medical and dental services, which are not readily available to them unless they spend yet more money in travelling expenses, meals, and in many cases overnight accommodation, where such services are found.
>
> Your department has several alternatives open to it if you are to convince residents of these communities that Ontario is indeed the province of opportunity and that the future is to be for people. You can establish a flying doctor service. You can service these areas with fully equipped mobile medical and dental clinics. You can establish permanent clinics in these communities, staffed by specially trained nurses, or you can make the cost of travelling and related expenses a direct charge against the present Ontario Medicare plan.

The minister did reply and said, "Well, we are vitally concerned about everything you mentioned and as time and money permit we will be doing something to achieve those ends." The minister mentioned as late as this afternoon that he did plan to bring in an omnibus bill that would provide for the setting up of many of these programmes to alleviate the shortage of health services in many remote and underserviced communities —but nothing of a specific nature.

I want to draw the minister's attention to an action taken by the Registered Nurses Association of Ontario at their convention held on the first week in May, wherein they gave unanimous consent to the setting up of a midwifery course that would give specialized training to a lot of these nurses and locate them in northern communities that lack the ability to attract doctors. The nurses see the significance of this move; they see how essential it is in order to get proper services to these northern and remote communities.

The minister hasn't indicated whether this will be a part of his bill, but I suggest to him that he is going to have to give very serious consideration to providing these communities with this kind of skilled person who will take the place of doctors that we are unable to attract into many northern communities.

The minister himself admitted that the present programme of financial incentives to doctors and dentists isn't working as well as it might and he's going to have to come up with other alternatives. He did even suggest that it might be necessary to train medical students in the north; I don't know whether he is talking about Laurentian University or Lakehead University, but it seems to me that the only way he is going to get a semblance of medical health care in the north is to train nurses to act as doctors' aids or give them special training to make a proper on-the-spot diagnosis with the assistance of doctors by radio-telephone hookups. It seems to me that you do have an additional responsibility to people who pay premiums for medical services and don't get those services unless they are prepared to drive 300 or 400 miles to a doctor's office, to a clinic or to a hospital.

The minister isn't paying any attention over there. He is grinning and he is talking to his officials in front. I suggest he take my comments a little bit more seriously. He does have a facility for coming up with the right answers but I want something positive and I want something concrete on behalf of all people living in the north in these remote communities.

The doctor said this afternoon that he gives his children fluoride pills and he is able to look after them in spite of the fact that his community isn't willing to introduce the proper amounts of fluoride into the water source in Belleville. A dentist who used to be in the employ of this department was making one of his many trips in the mobile railway dental car. He found himself putting partial plates in the mouths of grade 8 students at a time when this department said

they were doing an adequate job of providing this particular service to youngsterns in northern Ontario.

I have places in my riding where, if somebody has a toothache, they have to drive 350 miles to see a dentist. Yet in the 4½ years since I've been here, talking about the lack of such services, nothing has improved and there is no indication that it's going to improve under this minister.

He keeps saying that he is aware of the problem and they are studying it and they are trying to come up with ways and means of alleviating the problem. To date, neither he nor his three predecessors who have held this post since I have been in this Legislature, has done anything significant to contribute toward the deliverance of medical services in northern Ontario.

I hope the minister will take my comments seriously and indicate in an affirmative and tangible way that he is prepared to do something for the people in the north who pay the same premiums that he does and I do, yet these services aren't available to them. It is tantamount to fraud that he should be taking money away from people for a service that isn't available to them unless they are willing to spend sometimes $50 to $100 to get to these services that he and I down here take for granted.

I suggest that it is not adequate for the minister to sit here and say, "We know what the problem is. We are discussing it. We're studying it." I think he has to come up with something more positive and more concrete if he is going to convince the people of northern Ontario that he is even aware of the problem, let alone taking it seriously.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to understand the member for Thunder Bay. He knows perfectly well—

Mr. Stokes: You weren't listening.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The member knows perfectly well—I've heard this story so many times from the member and for the last 12 months I've discussed it many times with him. He knows darn well what is going on.

Mr. Stokes: What are you doing?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Don't you stand up here and say that you don't know. If you don't know, you should know.

Mr. Stokes: You haven't done a thing yet!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Potter: Just recently opened is a clinic in Armstrong. The member didn't bother mentioning that one. There is a doctor operating there. Since 1969, there have been 48 doctors sent to the north part of the province. Starting this summer, another clinic will be opened in Nakina. I told you several months ago and I told you recently in the letter which you wrote me—

Mr. Stokes: You didn't send a doctor to Armstrong. That was a National Defence doctor!

Hon. Mr. Potter: I told you recently—do you mind letting me have my say? I told you recently, when you wrote me, that McMaster University was working on a plan for northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: But there is no way we are going to start a plan without having it developed properly. It's proposed that the major teaching practice will be in Thunder Bay, Dryden and Atikokan, with a network of community health facilities developed and affiliated with these and the nearby villages such as Ignace, Vermilion Bay and Salmon Lake. It is proposed that many of the services of the villages will be provided by nurse practitioners. I spoke in this House just recently about the nurse practitioners who are being trained for that part of the province. All of these are under the supervision of local physicians.

So don't stand up here and say that nothing has been done, that nobody is telling you, because I have told you.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): You said you would come up with the right answers. What more proof do they want?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2301, shall item 1 carry?

Mr. Stokes: The minister has just said that he has made me aware. Now here is the reply that I got from the minister in answer to my letter that I will read into the record:

> Thank you very much for your letter of Feb. 3 concerning medical services in the northern communities. I am sure you will recall discussions we have had in the past in which we made proposals along the lines suggested. You can be sure that everything will be done to improve facilities in the north as quickly as possible. Any time that you are down here and

the opportunity presents itself, I would be delighted to discuss with you the problems in your riding.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): What is wrong with that?

Mr. Stokes: Well, what did he say?

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Did you go to see him?

Mr. Stokes: He is willing to discuss it with me. I have been writing him, and that's all I get. So, the only time to bring it up is now.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You wrote me and you got the answer. We discussed it before. You haven't come near me since.

Mr. Stokes: What are you going to do? You've got one little health clinic in the town of Armstrong and, other than that, what do you propose to do?

An hon. member: He just told you.

Mr. Stokes: I don't know. My riding is 110,000 square miles—

Mr. Gilbertson: A lot of it is moose country, nothing there.

Mr. Stokes: —and we've got one little health clinic in the town of Armstrong at a time when Northern Health Services is providing adequate dental facilities and nurse facilities in communities much more remote and much farther north than that.

As I say, in 4½ years all you have done is provided a mobile clinic to serve the needs of a doctor in Armstrong who is there by grace of the Department of National Defence. That is the extent of it. I think the minister can do better than that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We're spending $2 billion. Get up to date.

Mr. Stokes: You are spending about $2 billion. Surely the minister can come up with something more imaginative that one mobile clinic in the town of Armstrong.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South, please.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, there are a couple of questions I would like to ask. When a doctor or a dentist signs up under this guaranteed income programme for, say, $26,000 for the doctor, and I'm not sure quite what it is for the dentist, what supervision do you have to make sure that the doctor and the dentist are, in fact, working on a fairly full schedule to see that they perhaps, just by ordinary work, will make more than the guarantee that you give?

The second question I would like to ask is about the problem in a lot of northern communities of people having to come down to, say, Toronto, to see the major specialists for certain kinds of surgery or for diagnosis or this kind of thing. In the last two, three, or four years we have been able to attract a number of specialists up to the town of Timmins, but I think we could stand for a few more specialists, a paediatrician and—I don't know whether there is enough work for an orthopaedic specialist. Is there anything under this health resources fund to give some of the major centres a medical centre, so that people within reasonable travelling distances could go there and get the kind of treatment that now they are coming down to Toronto for? It's fine for those who can afford it; but, in other cases, welfare departments are having to pick it up, and so on.

I'm just wondering whether part of this money is being expended to develop the hospital facilities or something like this; whether you have this in your research or in your planning, because I think that if this could be done and the facilities expanded in a place like Timmins and perhaps Kirkland Lake and some of these other centres, it could cut down the travelling expenses. We've gone a long way in providing some of these specialists there now, and we just might be able to get a few more there, and it would be a real help to the problem in the north.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The problem is we cannot have duplication of services, as you know. Even in Toronto, we have two or three hospitals, one to do cardiac cases or at least heart transplants. It is not feasible.

Mr. Ferrier: We don't want that kind of involvement.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I appreciate that, but, by the same token, the main problem we have is in establishing family physicians throughout the province, which is the first patient contact. They are badly needed in all areas of the province and that is why the fund was set up. As far as some of the specialties are concerned, it just is not feasible in the northern part of the province. Thunder Bay, Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury all are well equipped for most of the major procedures today. Even in Sud-

bury now, we have a cardiovascular team that is prepared to do this kind of work in that part of the province.

Transportation being what it is today it is much more logical that patients be transported for major surgical procedures where the facilities are better, where the staff is better, where the patient has much better care and a much better opportunity for a speedy recovery than he would have if we were to establish a number of smaller surgical centres throughout the province.

The funds that are available under this programme in the member's part of the country guarantee an annual income of $33,000. That is a guaranteed income. The doctor's books are open for audit at the end of the year. The control on this is that if we find a doctor says he only makes $5,000 and expects us to put up the $28,000, it indicates that he isn't doing very much and he is not really needed in that part of the province, if that is all the work he is doing. So that is the control we have over it.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 carry? The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions I would like to ask the minister. I notice under this vote that the federal health grants operating fund gives to your department $250,000. I would ask the minister what is the total amount of federal money coming into his department in all the various aspects of it?

While your officials are looking up this total amount, I might revert to the subject of medical schools and practitioners. In doing research in this department, I note that, I believe, one out of four very qualified medical school applicants is rejected in our province because of lack of space. I just wonder what impetus the minister is giving to the Minister of Colleges and Universities in this regard. Unfortunately, his estimates are on at the same time and I would like to go downstairs to ask him this question—what he is doing about giving impetus to the increase in the number of medical doctors that we are going to turn out in this province.

I note, on reading various articles, that the University of Windsor in conjunction with the University of Western Ontario is setting up some type of satellite operation for the involvement of more people in this field. I wonder if the minister would comment on this. Also, the Province of Manitoba, I notice, is giving a new direction toward the encouragement of general practitioners. Possibly the minister is aware of this. I wonder if he and his colleagues have given thought to the same type of procedure here in the Province of Ontario.

There is one thing that has been bothering me in relation to medical students. I notice a controversy in relation to their applications, and that involves part of the criteria for a student. One of the questions now being asked of these students is in relation to their attitude on going into the medical profession: Is it for the dollars and cents or for the humanitarian reasons?

I just wonder is this really a fair question to be asking these students, because I am sure that after they get into the second, third or fourth year that possibly their attitudes are going to change, with more involvement than when they come right out of high school when possibly they are not mature enough to make a really objective assessment of the medical profession. Possibly many good students who would make great doctors are being barred from our medical schools because of this one question on their attitude. I trust the minister can comment on this particular aspect.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes. As far as medical education is concerned, we aren't concerned —at least we don't have anything to do with the methods of selection of students. This comes under Colleges and Universities. Our main concern is in curriculum and the number of students that are expected to graduate. As I have said earlier today, I'm concerned at the number of students that were graduating and we must increase this number as rapidly as we can.

The Mustard report which was submitted some months ago has recommended that rather than explore the possibility of starting more medical schools—which as we all know take a good 10 years to establish—we can almost double our intake into medical schools and make use of the tremendous amount of clinical material that is available in the smaller hospitals throughout the province.

Already McMaster University, along with its programme of providing improved health services in northwestern parts of the province, is planning on working very closely with Thunder Bay as a satellite hospital in other areas of the province. Down in this area of the province we have been discussing with universities the possibility of using

such centres. We would consider working very closely with such centres as Sudbury and even Peterborough, Oshawa, and some of the other areas down in southeastern Ontario. But if this can be worked out, and I see no reason why it shouldn't be, then the number of students being admitted to our medical schools can be increased very substantially.

The $250,000 operating fund that you were talking about is a fund that Ottawa sets up for us. It provides funds in which the ministry pays claims made by agencies that are eligible to receive national health grants. In other words, if they are eligible for national health grants, we pay them out of this fund. Then when Ottawa pays the grants it goes back into the fund so that that $250,000 is sitting there all the time. When we find an agency that is eligible for one of the national health grants, it comes out of that. Ottawa pays and it goes back in. It is just a fund set up there to operate out of.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, can the minister give me a figure of the total amount of dollars from Ottawa that comes into his department through its various programmes? Have you any basic idea of this?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The estimates for this year are $1,700,000. Last year they amounted to $4,242,000.

Mr. Lewis: No, for all programmes, he said. That's pocket money.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh no, this was grants for professional training, mental health research, public health research, general public health, cancer—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We are talking about hospitalization.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh, I haven't got that, but I'll get it for you. I'll have to work that one out.

Mr. Lewis: I am always being edged out by my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, so it is very nice of you to allow me to have a word or two—especially after the obstreperousness of the member for Thunder Bay.

I want to ask two or three questions which will hearken back to matters that are already covered, and raise one or two others which flow from them and which haven't yet been discussed. I am sorry I didn't get into discussion rather more coherently on the issues as they were raised. It is not always possible.

I want to go back to the ARF just to say this: Like many members of the House, I have had my qualms about the foundation from time to time. I've not always found it was available to scrutiny as some other government agencies, although perhaps in the very nature of its work that is fair. I've always been a little mystified by precisely what it did and how successful it was. But again, perhaps by the nature of its work, there is necessarily some truth in that. Basically, I think most members of the House have been impressed by the way in which the foundation pursues its job and much of the good common sense and impact it has around the province. However, some of us would wish to reinforce it even more.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, that I, I think like a great many members of the House, was profoundly distressed by the really bitter assault on the foundation that came from the member for Humber. I think it did the foundation very considerable damage publicly. I have had a number of avenues of feedback and it was not an attack which was in any sense temperate or moderate. Indeed, in terms of attacks in this House one would have thought that it came almost from the loyal opposition rather than from the loyal government.

I want to remind you that the member at one point characterized the report on the use of marijuana as,

> —a mockery of scientific method for this agency to insult the intelligence of this House, of the medical fraternity and of the people of Ontario to suggest that this 90-day study reflects the ability of marijuana users to function in nearly normal social and economic conditions.

He said on another instance:

> It is my intention to ask the hon. Minister of Health for details of this wanton and reckless disregard for the most fundamental tenets of scientific inquiry and this inexcusable lack of concern for the effects of their words on our impressionable young people.

He said at another point:

> I have asked the hon. Minister of Health today in writing for an inquiry into the total operation of of the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation because of numerous complaints I have received over the past several years and in light of the recent dismissal, the unwarranted dismissal, of Dr. Andrew Malcolm.

The minister smiles and I smile; we will leave it at that inscrutable exchange of smiles. The member for Humber said:

> There were also complaints about staff members using drugs, there have also been complaints of the waste of public funds, particularly in the funding of the street programmes like Digger House, for example, which is now defunct.

Indeed, alas, it is now defunct We had a real voice of reaction enter the House into that speech. And that is fair enough, because there are no sensitivities worn on the sleeves more openly than those involving drug use and abuse.

In the minister's response to the Leader of the Opposition I thought he might have been a little stronger in the defence of the foundation if for no other reason than the public reassurance, because I have not recently seen an attack less documented than that one. It was largely an attack, it seemed, based on the dismissal of Dr. Andrew Malcolm, and at some point I presume the minister will report to the House his findings in that area. He can do it now; if he is not comfortable now we will press him in the question period. He said he was meeting with Dr. Archibald and discussing it.

I was really concerned at the time and remain so to this day at this quite extraordinary attack on the foundation and what it is attemping to do. I hope at some point—perhaps I can pause; I won't pause, I want to go on to another point—that I can solicit from the minister a rather more ringing support than the measured response he gave earlier.

In the area of mental health, with which I have some contact, and in a number of social agencies in the field, some of which have been alluded to this evening, the alarm bells rang and tremendous apprehensions grew about an attack on a government agency. It is largely unprecedented for a private member to launch that kind of attack and there seems to be no response! It is as though the government were running a trial balloon to see whether the ARF could be put in its place or brought to the ground.

I mean, when the member for Oxford (Mr. Parrott) makes his speech to the dental association and it largely agrees with the views of New Democrats, one can understand the essential force, weight and substance of the speech. When it is raised in question period and the minister, without accepting it, doesn't demolish it, one can see that perhaps it did have the quality of a trial balloon, with the certain infectious candour that the member for Oxford brings to what he says.

But this attack by the member for Humber was a pernicious attack and it has to be dealt with publicly. It is quite uncalled for and uncharacteristic. I don't pretend to whitewash the foundation, God knows. If many of us had more time in this House to learn more about the workings of the various agencies of government, there are things which it could perform, which it might like to perform, and can't now, because of constraints of funding, or whatever.

I was really concerned about what happened on that occasion and the fact that the minister has yet to say to the hon. member for Humber, as he says to us, "Look, fella, you're completely and totally off base and you'd better control yourself, because there is more at stake, in terms of the public's perception of our primary social agency in this field, than the capacity to sound off in the Legislature."

That was all I wanted to say about that particular aspect. Maybe the minister will favour me with a small reply in respect of it. Maybe he will tell us whether he has resolved the Dr. Andrew Malcolm problem to his satisfaction in his conversations with Dr. Archibald.

I have one other question relating to the ARF. The ARF has done a number of studies, demonstrating—perhaps it didn't require studies—that the consumption of alcohol relates rather markedly to the price, and that one of the finest deterrents to the undue consumption of alcohol consists in the pricing of spirits and wine, beer, etc. Without advocating any particular price policy, it is noteworthy that this province, unlike almost any other province I can recall, from BC to Quebec in any event, has found that the cost of living has greatly outstripped any comparable increase in the cost of alcohol.

All right, let me ask the minister a question then. Has he been in discussion with the provincial Treasurer about the relationship between cost and the proclivity to drink? Have they discussed the use of taxes as a disincentive to undue use of alcohol? Does he think that he can simply handle it through the various—what did they call it? What are these centres around the province?

Mr. Ferrier: Detoxification centres.

Mr. Lewis: The detoxification centres around the province. Is he satisfied that that's an adequate response?

The ARF has established that 95 per cent of the changes in consumption are accounted for by price factors. I can quote a study which uses the phrase "inextricably linked," when it talks about drinking patterns and costs in this particular area. Without, again, getting into precise costs and the last budget and previous budgets, is this a matter of discussion with the Treasurer? Is the government looking at tax as one of the main pre-

ventive front lines, or is it relying largely on the responses to excessive drinking or alcoholism in Ontario?

So, if I can review—and I don't want to relinquish my place, Mr. Chairman—if I may, then, first, the reputation of the ARF; second, the position of Dr. Malcolm and, third, the question of taxation and consumption.

Hon. Mr. Potter: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to wait until I've had the opportunity, as I said earlier tonight, to check one or two of the cases that were presented by the hon. member when he made his charges, before I make any definite statement to him along that line in the House, as he's suggested, but I'll assure him that it will be done.

Mr. Lewis: All right.

Hon. Mr. Potter: As far as the taxes are concerned, I am one of those people who believes, if we're going to tax anything, these are the things that should be taxed. Alcoholism and drugs are costing the taxpayers of Ontario a terrific amount of money, as far as treatment facilities are concerned. I think that if we're going to tax, and we need more money in these areas, then we should get it by taxes on these items. So far I haven't had an opportunity to discuss this with the provincial Treasurer, but I think you'll agree, I've hardly had time to dig into that, but I will have before too long.

A question was asked, if I may, on the amount of money that came from Ottawa. Can I answer that at the present time?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, all right, if you want to answer that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Last year the total amount came to $649,942,469. This year grants will be $742,300,000 as compared to $649,942,000.

Mr. Lewis: Does the member for Essex South want to pursue that?

Mr. Paterson: No.

Mr. Lewis: All right. May I come briefly then to the question of Parcost and ask the minister, first of all, what happened to the series of—I don't know how to characterize them—the revelations, I suppose, that appeared in the Ottawa Citizen some little time ago dealing with the various pharmacists in Ottawa? It said a very good number of those who were using the Parcost label were charging above the acceptable prescription rate. What happened to that? Was there disciplinary action? Were there any prosecutions? What flowed from it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: In that particular instance they were charged by the Ontario College of Pharmacy, and in several cases the licences were suspended.

Mr. Lewis: Is that so? Could we have a report on that rather more specifically?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, we will get that for you.

Mr. Lewis: My memory is that if there were a dozen companies, 10 of the 12 were above the Parcost level, and that was just in Ottawa.

Let me ask you then, if in fact licences were suspended: I am both surprised and heartened it was taken so seriously and I would appreciate the details before the estimates are through. If, in fact, that happened in Ottawa, was there similar spot-checking by your department of other centres in the province, based on what was revealed by the Citizen's study?

Hon. Mr. Potter: This is going on continually around the province. It is ongoing.

Mr. Lewis: Are you finding examples of violations of Parcost in communities other than Ottawa? If so, what happens?

Hon. Mr. Potter: There are the odd cases that are turning up. In each case, it has been reported to the college and the college again will be dealing with the same thing as Ottawa.

Mr. Lewis: I see. Could we have some kind of information about that process? Maybe it is unfair to implicate individual pharmacies since it is a government thing rather than the press, but perhaps you could indicate communities in which the pharmacies are resident, and whether it resulted in further suspension.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, I think this is part of the ongoing study we are doing, not only in pharmacy but the whole health field. I would be delighted to bring a report to the Legislature periodically on what is going on as far as the surveys are concerned and how they have been handled.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Well, the Parcost one seems particularly appropriate because there was, of course, a great buildup. Whenever one of these fancily coloured reports comes out—I had one on my desk a little while

ago but it has evaporated—from Parcost indicating to us the quality testing that is taking place and the seriousness with which the government treats it, one would wish there were an application at the level of the consumer. Apparently there hasn't been. I think the member for Essex South, or perhaps it was Nipissing, indicated earlier that Parcost has been a profound disappointment in terms of lowering the cost of drugs. Certainly the Ottawa survey suggested that Parcost was but a device in increase the cost of drugs.

What you do by using the Parcost system on the window of your store is seduce the public into thinking that they are getting a better deal in drugs. By such seductive process you acquire a greater profit than you might have acquired had Parcost not existed at all. That's a most extraordinary variation on a theme—that Parcost should be used to increase the price of drugs for consumers by a most objectionable means.

I was really impressed with that Ottawa Citizen survey. That's why I'm hanging this hat on it fairly strongly. I remember reading it carefully, thinking how neatly they had chosen—I think it was two drugs—and how carefully they had gone to a representative sample of pharmacy and what astonishing results they had found in a very short period of time.

If that is true across the province, it reduces to ridicule the Parcost scheme. It makes it vastly more imperative than any might have thought that the right to substitution be brought in.

In fact, we in this party would say that a Crown corporation be developed under ODC which, if it didn't manufacture drugs, at least could provide for the distribution and wholesaling or retailing of those drugs through that vast sector of the economy, and the public sector in the initial instance, where prices could be brought down.

We on this side are all very concerned about Parcost being used as a device to increase drug prices.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think you'll find, Mr. Chairman, that it is because of the Ottawa situation that we are finding fewer and fewer all the time in the survey that is going on. The fact that this survey is going on demonstrates to us that there isn't the abuse now that there was then; it is gradually being decreased. I can assure you that the programme is being quite successful.

Mr. Lewis: We shall come back to the minister then for the survey, at some point. I say that because this minister has a very charming and infinite capacity to say: "Yes, I'll bring the information to you. Yes, I'll make a statement to the House. Yes, I'll inform you." And I am making notes. I have now, I think, 43 pages of your promised surveys, reports, documents—all the rest of it.

One day in question period, I'm going to ask you every single one of them and I will be kind enough to give you 24 hours' notice in the hope that they can all be read simultaneously. But I just—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): Did you say 43 pages? You have been busy.

Mr. Lewis: —want to remind the minister that he is a man of constant undertakings. He undertakes before this House the production of goods and services equalled by none of his colleagues. In fact, collectively they couldn't approximate his capacity for survey taking, information disseminating, and the general delivery of services in his department.

I want to say to him that one day we are going to try to call him to account, and remind him of all these documents which are in process, but of which none has yet emerged.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh, you will get them.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, I think you have said that within two weeks you're going to decide on Parcost. You're going to decide whether you are going to substitute drugs, or you're going to have a report, or you're going to have legislation. You are pretty confident about that, eh?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Mark you, Mr. Chairman, it now being 10 of the clock on May 15, we will be back by May 29 to see whether or not you've come through, and we'll learn what is going to happen to the use of drugs in Ontario.

May I then move to this fascinating little item which is under the statutory, I think—maybe it's not statutory; I'd best be careful Does "S" mean statutory? Because if so, there appears to be $10,000 to the governors of the University of Toronto, Banting and Best research fund. What is that, apart from what it seems to be?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well—

An hon. member: He could tell you.

Mr. Lewis: You are going to prepare a report on it, you're going to tell us.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh, no, I've got it.

An hon. member: He's got the answers.

Hon. Mr. Potter: As a matter of fact, way back in 1923 the Act was passed known as the Banting and Best Act. It authorized the statutory payment of $10,000 annually for the purpose of enabling Drs. Banting and Best and their co-workers to carry on work in the various fields of medical research, and it has continued ever since. This grant is paid to the governors of the University of Toronto and applied to a special trust fund for this specific purpose.

Mr. Lewis: A question then: What relation will this have to the proposed takeover of Connaught Laboratory by the Canadian Development Corp.? Has this been discussed with the University of Toronto in terms of their relationship after CDC takes over Connaught?

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is no relation at all to this grant and the takeover of University of Toronto by the federal government.

Mr. Lewis: The medical research will continue, in this case, in another field.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's right.

Mr. Lewis: Okay. I just wanted to sort that out.

There is an item in the first vote in this omnibus vote dealing with the College of Nurses and the Registered Nurses Association of Ontario.

I understand that they are simply direct subsidies—I presume they are smallish amounts. But they do allow for opening up the question of the tuition fees and board and room costs being levied on potential or actual nursing students as a result of the recent budget.

I cannot help but feel that both the College of Nurses and the RNAO must in their protective moments be concerned about what is going to happen to the students. Since we have not yet wrung a reply from Colleges and Universities or from the Premier (Mr. Davis), can we wring a reply from you? What is going to happen to these students? When is the revision in the student awards programme going to take place to allow them to continue their intended nursing education? What will the formula be? When will they know about it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well I think it was explained that starting this fall, all nurses in the first and second year will pay their tuition fees.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Potter: But only the first-year nurses will pay room and board and second-year nurses will not pay their room and board this year. So starting this fall, the nurses entering the school will pay $250 tuition fee. That is right isn't it? Sure.

At the present time when any student is applying for student awards he or she is expected to provide $500 through summer employment. The nurses won't be expected to do this because they don't work over the summer months; they don't have the time off. So when they are applying for assistance, as many of them will, they will be given an extra $500 that they don't have to show as income.

At the same time there are many bursaries available. Practically all of the schools of nurses have bursaries available to those who need it. As a matter of fact one or two of the schools I've talked to said that they never have all of the bursaries applied for and used up. So there shouldn't be any difficulties at all.

Mr. Lewis: Oh well, my apologies to you Mr. Minister. I wasn't aware that you had indicated that. In other words there will be no tuition fee in effect?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I didn't say that.

Mr. Lewis: Well there will be a dispensation for the equivalent of $500 in the student award programme for any nurse—

Hon. Mr. Potter: This is what happens in the student award; when they are applying for an award they are expected to earn, say, $500 through summer employment. The nurses won't be expected to do this, so that when they are evaluating the award they will be taking that into account.

Mr. Lewis: So they become eligible to borrow more?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is right.

Mr. Lewis: Is that what happens?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They are eligible for a higher grant.

Mr. Lewis: I see. So that their indebtedness to Ontario can increase under the philanthropy of government? That is one way of putting it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think it should be made clear that there is no indebtedness to Ontario. With the Province of Ontario it is grants.

Mr. Lewis: It is what? Grants?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The grants are from the Province of Ontario; the federal government is student loans.

Mr. Lewis: I see. You wouldn't like to make sufficient grants available so that they don't have to go to the federal government for loans?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would love to.

Mr. Lewis: You would love to? Well you need only speak to your colleagues. They would love to as well.

Mr. Paterson: You have changed the rules of the ballgame.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, well I don't know how those rules got changed. I presume that the hon. provincial Treasurer is the person to ask that. Yes, that is all I wanted to ask.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay. The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of questions: What the minister has said in effect is that a young person who has contemplated entering nursing education this fall will be faced with an expenditure of perhaps $2,000 more than they considered prior to this change in government policy. As I understand it they will now have to pay their room and board and they will have to stay in the residences that are provided by the nursing schools. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, that is not right.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well as I understand it, in some cases in particular the costs will be around $1,400 to $1,500 for their room and board. Beyond that there is the extra expenditure of the tuition of $250. So you are talking about an increase in cost to them of at least $1,750. Part of this may be taken up by the revision in the student award programme, where their summer savings won't be charged against them.

But, of course, you have got to understand that summer savings aren't charged against other people who really don't have summer savings as well. There is no real major difference in the student award programme, but in effect the cost for these people is going to be considerably higher.

I want to ask the minister whether this is having a detrimental effect on the applications that have so far been received by the schools and if some other arrangement is going to be made, other than the change in the student award programme, to offset this extra cost.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier today, this isn't something that was decided overnight. For as long as four years, as far as I can recollect, there have been communications—and certainly to me—from many of the nurses, the student nurses, the nurses' association and the college of nursing requesting that this be done. Now that it has been done, of course, it is just like everything else: there is always a certain amount of flak.

But they requested specifically that the nurses should not be treated any differently than anybody else in the post-secondary education field. That's why this is being done, and there is no intention of changing anything now. I have said that as far as the grants and the loans are concerned, they will apply to them the same as anybody else going on to post-secondary education.

I am trying to get information from the school of nursing; what I have had so far would indicate that it has had no effect whatever on the number of students applying to enter the school next fall. Now, if any further information becomes available, I will make it available to the House.

Mr. Lewis: Aha! I am making a note of that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is 44.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister will recall two or three weeks ago, I brought his attention to a problem of doctors operating pharmacies in communities where there was a recognized and accredited pharmacist. The minister indicated there was something he could do in spite of the fact that I had assurances from both colleges, the College of Pharmacy and the College of Physicians and Surgeons, that they weren't

disposed to doing anything about it. I wonder if he has anything to report on that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, certainly. A physician can run a pharmacy for patients that he is looking after; there is no way you can stop this. But if there is more than one doctor in an area, or if prescriptions are coming into the area from another doctor, and if there is a registered pharmacist in that area, yes, we can stop the physician from filling those prescriptions.

Mr. Stokes: Well, in this particular situation a doctor is operating a pharmacy in his clinic. And while he is out at the hospital, the prescriptions are not being filled by the doctor; they are being filled by a nurse or a receptionist and bear her signature, indicating that she is the pharmacist. I am told this is against the Pharmacy Act. I am also told that they are sending them out to distant points to other nurses when there is a pharmacist right there who is competent, ready, willing and able to provide this service.

The reason for my bringing it to the minister's attention is that this particular community had great difficulty in attracting a pharmacist. For several years, it was without one and when they were able to attract one, they find that the doctor is prescribing a greater percentage of the drugs. The people in this community feel very strongly that they will lose their pharmacist. if this doctor continues on in the present practice.

Now, it is quite evident that the people are paying considerably more to the doctor than they would to the recognized and accredited pharmacist in the community, and they have asked me to bring it to the attention of the minister. I brought it to the attention of your deputy and I have written to the College of Pharmacy. They are reluctant to do anything about it. The minister indicated two or three weeks ago that he could do something about it and I haven't heard from him. I am wondering under the circumstances, as I have described them, is there anything you can do to protect this pharmacist and the people in that community.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, so far—I didn't want to mention this but I will. The reason the prescriptions weren't being sent out to another nurse, they were being sent out to another pharmacist outside the municipality, because in this particular case the information I got was that they did not have any confidence in the pharmacist who was there. I wasn't prepared to accept that and we are checking into it in greater detail.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Algoma was wishing to speak a moment ago?

Mr. Gilbertson: Mr. Chairman, I have a few things I'd like to bring to the attention of the minister. I know he was in my riding and we were in the east part of it pretty much, and he was there assessing the needs, the medical needs of the area.

He is aware that in Bruce Mines there is a group of people who are interested in establishing a medical clinic, and they would like to have the assurance of the minister and his department that they will co-operate in every way they can to see that when this clinic is established that they are assured of getting doctors. This is one thing that I would like to get on the record. I would like to have the co-operation of the department in this; if they would help us in every way they can to see that we will get doctors for this clinic. We would like to establish this clinic and hope that we can have three doctors, a dentist, and perhaps a public health nurse and a pharmacy, all in the same building.

An hon. member: You know where you can get the dentist.

Mr. Lewis: That makes good sense.

Mr. Gilbertson: This will service a population of approximately 7,000 people. I am sure that the minister realizes that we don't have adequate medical service at the present time. I think they have about 70 doctors in Sault Ste. Marie, but they are all so busy that many times when people come from the more remote areas that they have to wait maybe two or three hours to be able to see the doctor.

Mr. Lewis: They are all treating the member.

Mr. Gilbertson: And I am sure that we can improve on the health services in Algoma. This is particularly central Algoma. Now, when the doctor came up, I mean the minister, we were supposed to go to Wawa and the west part of the riding; but on account of weather conditions and the condition of the airstrip we couldn't go, because it was a little bit risky. But he has assured me that in June he is going to come up to Wawa and then we'll assess that area—

Mr. Lewis: It would be a good place for a clinic.

Mr. Gilbertson: —and see what the conditions are and what they can do to improve the medical service in that particular area. Now we have got Hornepayne, which has been quite isolated. They are on the railroad, but they have been rather isolated as far as getting out to the main centre of Algoma, like Sault Ste. Marie for instance. But with this new highway that is going to be completed this summer, they can be in Sault Ste. Marie in about five hours, and I am sure that the people are going to appreciate this very much.

But this town has got a population of approximately 2,000 people and most of the time they have only had one doctor. I believe there has been a railroad dental car; and that is the dental service that they have had. I am not aware that there is any dentist in the town at the present time.

Mr. Stokes: You didn't need to be ashamed to mention it; it's Hornepayne.

Mr. Gilbertson: Then we had Dubreuiville, a lumbering town with about 800 population. I know that they were trying to get an ambulance. I believe they have an ambulance there now, but they were hoping that they could get perhaps a trained nurse to be able to come and live there and that would help to alleviate at least part of their medical situation.

Then we have White River with a population of about 1,000 people. I know that they have a doctor in White River, but they are 50 or 60 miles away from Wawa, which is the closest hospital. I know that they have an ambulance in White River and I believe it is a good one; it's a new one, I believe.

There is one thing that is of concern in a northern area like this. As you know, it can get down to 40 below, 50 below—and White River has been as cold as 72 below zero—and you have to have a proper place to house an ambulance. The ambulance has to be ready and if it has to sit outside, or hasn't got proper housing you are going to run into difficulties. I am a northerner and I know it can be a very serious situation if you try to start a vehicle that is sitting outside.

We know that Wawa is the largest centre in the western part of my riding and I believe they have maybe three doctors there. But what I would like to see is some way that we could improve the medical service for the outlying areas—to see if we can't sort of group it all together and have better medical service.

I am hoping that we can get full co-operation from the medical association and the minister's department to go ahead with this medical clinic and be assured that when we do get it there, we will have staff for it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member for Algoma knows, when I was up there with him—I mentioned this at the time—the suggestion was made that the government should build a clinic for the doctors to work out of. I am sure that we all appreciate that the medical schedule of fees as it is today is based on the assumption that 35 to 40 per cent of the fees go for operating expenses and that the doctor provides his own facilities. There is no way we as a government can use money to provide facilities for doctors to operate out of.

At the same time, in the area that the member is talking about there are three physicians at the present time; granted they are spread out a little bit. I think it would be a wonderful situation if they could get together and work out of one building where they could have a dentist—if not permanently, at least several days a week. Then they would be able to cover each other as far as holidays, Sundays, nights, weekends and so on are concerned. This would be an ideal situation.

Unfortunately, it is a little difficult for some of them to get together up there and there is no way I can guarantee the people in that area that I can coerce the doctors to work together if they don't want to get in on the programme. Certainly, we will give them all the assistance we can, but I cannot guarantee that I will get another doctor to them. They have three there now. There are other areas of the province that need them much worse than they do.

By the same token, when we talk about improving services this is one of the things that we are in the process of trying to do.

At Sault Ste. Marie at the present time they are equipped to receive electrocardiogram tracings over the telephone. Hopefully in these smaller communities we will get the nurse assistants set up so that they will be able to take tracings and transmit them over the telephone to centres like Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay, and larger areas where the decision can be made whether or not the patient should be flown out or whether a doctor should be flown in to them.

This is part of the programme for that part of the province which is now under way. It is rather interesting to see some of these

things come in over the wire; somebody just takes the receiver and drops it into the box and the tracing comes out on the electrocardiograph.

I want to assure the hon. member that certainly we will assist all ways we can, but one thing I can't do is guarantee them that they are going to have three doctors in that clinic under the present circumstances.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Chairman, there are two or three questions I would like to ask of the minister. First of all, in connection with the fees that now are being applied to student nurses, could the minister tell us whether there will be any consideration given to those student nurses who came into the programme in the first year and have now completed their first year, who came in not expecting that there would be the fees for their second year? My first question is whether there will be any consideration—

Mr. Chairman: I think the minister has answered that question twice this evening now.

Mr. Rhodes: I am sorry, I was not in the House all the time. If it has been answered, I will read it in Hansard. Thank you.

My second question deals with the detoxification centres. I am sure this has been asked but I would like to get an answer because I didn't hear it. With the centres that are being established in the major metropolitan areas, such as Metropolitan Toronto and other centres, can we expect in the smaller communities in the other parts of the province, and specifically in the north, if there won't be detoxification centres, will there at least be some sort of a facility that can be used by those people in these communities who are concerned with this approach to try to assist these people who are involved with alcohol?

The third question I would like to ask the minister is, what success is being enjoyed in getting general practitioners to go into the smaller communities and set up practice? By smaller communities, I am referring to a city like Sault Ste. Marie, where I understand it is a problem to get general practitioners to come in and to set up a practice. Is there any success?

Mr. Chairman: These questions have been quite thoroughly discussed earlier in the evening. Perhaps we shoud go on to something fresh.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is one matter that may or may not have been discussed; it is that item for $46 million, the health resources development plan. I know that from time to time the minister has made statements as to how they are prepared to strengthen the development of hospital facilities in certain communities, but if the minister could give us some information as to the disposition of the $46 million this year, I would like to follow up after that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Health resources development plan.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Can the minister tell us who it is that comes in here with this information every now and then? Perhaps it would be helpful if he introduced the people from the department who are assisting him.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It would take too long.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Besides, they want to remain anonymous.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who is the gentleman who comes and goes there with all the latest information?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, you see, they come in and sit down all prepared to answer a question, and you fellows get up and you start talking about something alse.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, you are going to have to get these estimates reordered, because this is one mess. It is a mess.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I agree with you.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There's the man who can fix it. It is a good thing he came in.

An hon. member: He's not hard to get along with.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think I made the statement once before that it's like a cat's breakfast or something.

Mr. R. S. Smith: You must have a Leo Cahill in there sending them in and out.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Anyway, do you want me to start at the beginning of this health resources thing?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, it is $46 million; we might as well spend a minute or two on it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: First of all, the plan has four major objectives. First, educational training, involving a capital programme to increase the production of essential health manpower. The Ontario health resources development plan incorporates a construction programme to improve, expand and create the facilities necessary to produce essential health manpower of quality and in numbers necessary to help meet the health needs of the province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Make a note of that one.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Have you got that written down?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You'd better tell us how you are going to spend the money.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You want me to show you where the money is going this year?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What are you going to do with the $46 million? Don't give us that business about improving the facilities.

Hon. Mr. Potter: All right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Give us the facts.

Hon. Mr. Potter: First of all, $40 million is being spent on a capital programme—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's a good part.

Hon. Mr. Potter: This consists of University Hospital in London, $8 million; basic sciences building, University of Western Ontario, $2 million; Victoria Hospital paediatric facility, $500,000; the College of Health Sciences and Teaching Hospital, McMaster University, Hamilton, $4,409,000 for treatment facilities and $4,409,000 for education which gives a total of $8,818,000; the University of Toronto central planning $100,000—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I thought the hon. Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) was bad. This guy's worse.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Is this what you want?

An hon. member: Yes, keep going.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Get the marbles out.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mount Sinai Hospital—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: "Seenai?"

Hon. Mr. Potter: —has $4 million—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is that? What do you train there?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Sunnybrook Hospital, Toronto, $6,327,000; Health Sciences Centre, Queen's University, down in God's country, Kingston, $2,185,000—

An hon. member: It's a matter of—

Hon. Mr. Potter: St. Mary's on the Lake in Kingston, $1,310,000; University of Ottawa Health Sciences Centre, $1,260,000; Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario in Ottawa, $1,968,000—

Mr. Stokes: Now come to the north!

Hon. Mr. Potter: Schools of nursing—

Mr. Stokes: That must be the north!

Hon. Mr. Potter: —schools of health technology, $1,615,000; colleges of applied arts and technology, $1,700,000; some small projects under $100,000, $217,000. That is $40 million!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: The way I count, that's only $38 million.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): You can't count too well.

Hon. Mr. Potter: They were slipping down a little bit. Have to tighten them. This is non-capital expenditures. It amounts to $6 million. Bursaries $1,305,000; preceptorships $85,000; community health facilities $975,000; establishment of practice $415,000; community nursing $50,000; guaranteed incomes $450,000; special training $35,000; demonstration projects $2,035,000; and regional planning $650,000. That adds up to $6 million.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, while the minister is in such a mood to impart information, I would say to him that almost every one of the items he raised should have been specifically itemized in these estimates. It really is irresponsible of whoever established this estimate book that they would lump all these matters—health resources development plan, alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation as you call it and so on—under a single item in one vote. It is ridiculous that you should ask us to discuss the items this way.

We have got a few minutes left before we adjourn and I would just say to the minister that if he is getting a bit uneasy or tired of answering questions about expenditures, he might as well get out of this

job because he is going to have some tall questions to answer in the next few days. The minister knows that he is spending now more than the Minister of Education is asking for. His level of expenditure makes the Premier's expenditure as Minister of Education look like peanuts. He is now asking for $2,028 million and if he thinks he can hide away $46 million at the end of a list of items and then object to giving information about it, he is certainly the wrong man for the job.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I didn't object to giving you information.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right.

Hon. Mr. Potter: All you had to do was ask for it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right. Let me finish—

Hon. Mr. Potter: I have never seen you yet when you weren't prepared to ask me something.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am very much concerned about the money you are spending on so-called health resources. I had an interesting afternoon last Friday in the company of the minister and the hon. member for Parkdale talking to the OMA.

An hon. member: Is that right?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just like any other group, they are great gossips and they like to talk about this thing or that thing in the business. They were talking about the medical centre at Western University and what a grand place it is. As a former graduate of McMaster, I have admired the edifice on that campus from afar. If there has ever been a commitment of money to so-called medical resources in the last few years, this has been it! You have simply sent the trucks down there, full of $100,000 bills, if there are such things, and said: "You just build; and you can do it your own way."

Well, autonomy is fine, but surely you are going to have to make some very careful examination of the efficiency of these expenditures when you can ream off a list like you have, amounting supposedly to $46 million for this year alone, when you weren't establishing any medical schools—you know, you were just adding a few million dollars in tifficks to what's already there.

Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we came through the time when we were prepared to support without reservations expenditure in support of education. I believe we made many mistakes and we would be very ill-advised, whether it's someone in the ministry, or someone in opposition, to say: "Well, if it is for health services, it has got to be good."

In my view, there are people in the medical profession, as well as those associated with the delivery of our health programme, hospital administrators and others, who are making the education directors and the principals and the experts in the Department of Education, look like pikers. The money is just firehosing into these establishments and there is only one person that can either put the damper on it, or at least convince us and the people who pay the bills, that we are getting some substantial return. I don't know what we can do about it here.

I can remember being most annoyed when somebody sitting down here somewhere talked about the irrelevancy of the Legislature. But in this session I have felt it more and more, that even the members in the government are prepared to say: "Well, the experts say we should do it; therefore it is going to be done."

I am glad to see the Minister of Health shaking his head because I know that he is not that kind of minister; that he is not counting on going on to a leadership convention; or something like that. I believe that he is in this particular job because he believes he can do a good job at it and he can be tough. And I always admire ministers who can be tough, but you haven't demonstrated yet that you can be tough in this department.

I would just say to you that in the next three years, whoever is Minister of Health is going to have the toughest political job; because the searchlight of public criticism and opinion is going to be turned upon you; because you are going to be spending far more money than anybody else. Unless you have got the strength, not so much to withstand the criticism, but to answer it effectively, then you are going to be in substantial trouble.

I am not satisfied with the expenditure of this $46 million. I don't know what I can do about it. If I were to give the minister some advice in politics—and I have got to admit, that's a bit of a laugh—that he should certainly see that when this House adjourns, if we prorogue sometime in June or July, that there should be established a committee of members of this House who are going to go around the province talking to hospital administrators.

We can go and see the medical school at McMaster, and the one at Western, and the one in God's country, wherever that is, where the minister refers to it; and just listen to what these people are prepared to say in justification for the duplication of these many resources; that many of us have a funny, let's say ill-informed prejudice about medical schools. There is the feeling that maybe the profession is protecting themselves when they are objecting to so many so-called foreigners coming into this province with medical degrees.

Now, don't get uneasy, Mr. Chairman, I am just expressing my views. I will be finished in a moment.

I don't hesitate to recommend a select committee for this purpose, because I'll tell you that you are going to have to have some kind of a cost-control committee. Our experience in the past is that as part of this, the government will get a group of members of the Legislature to go around and look at the problem. Whether we can be effective or not I don't know, but I would suggest that that might be some small step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman: Will there be further discussion on 2301?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a lot of sound advice in what the Leader of the Opposition suggests.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn, I would like to say that tomorrow we will deal with items on the order paper, not necessarily in this order, because I am going backward at the moment: 18, 17, 7 and 3. I would also ask them to be prepared, if the minister returns, on numbers 8, 19, 11, 12 and 13. If we were to be successful in concluding those items, we would return to the consideration of estimates.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What estimates?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would suggest that probably the estimates of Natural Resources.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Could the House leader inform us what estimates will follow Colleges and Universities in committee, and what estimates will follow here after Health?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have given those estimates in sequence, I will just reiterate once again for the hon. member. In committee outside of the House we are currently considering Colleges and Universities, followed by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, followed possibly by the Management Board and Civil Service Commission. And in this House, at the conclusion of the estimates of the two ministries presently under consideration, the Ministry of Education and the Solicitor General.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 15, 1972

Estimates, Ministry of Health, Mr. Potter, continued 2445

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2473

No. 63

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again we have many visitors with us. Today, in the east gallery, we have students from Danforth Technical School of Toronto and the School Patrol from the township of Waterloo; in the west gallery, students from St. Joseph's School of Gananoque and Jarvis Collegiate Institute of Toronto. At 3 o'clock, in the east gallery, we will have students from Kincardine High School of Kincardine and Neil McNeil School of Scarborough.

Statements by the ministry.

GUARANTEED LOANS TO INDUSTRIAL MILK PRODUCERS

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the intention of the government of Ontario to implement a programme of guaranteed bank loans to assist industrial milk producers in this province to purchase market sharing quota, to which is attached subsidy eligibility quota from the Canadian Dairy Commission.

We are definitely interested in maintaining and expanding the industrial milk industry in Ontario, and we want to be very sure that no producer is deprived of market sharing quota because of lack of operating capital.

Basically the programme will consist of chartered bank loans with the government of Ontario guaranteeing these loans. The loans will be at prime interest rates plus one per cent, repayable at any time without penalty.

Having announced the government's intention in this regard, I want to assure the members of the Legislature through you, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as the administrative details have been worked out, and the necessary forms printed, we will be taking steps to ensure that every milk producer in Ontario is fully aware of the opportunities created by this programme.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

GUARANTEED LOANS TO INDUSTRIAL MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture why non-market sharing quota, or let's say non-subsidy market sharing quota, is excluded? What is the purpose of continuing with the non-subsidy market sharing quota?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the market sharing quota is a very complex situation, believe me, and I can't attempt to answer it all in detail.

As I understand it, the market sharing quota is the amount of quota that is allocated to each province by the Canadian Dairy Commission for the production of industrial milk within the province. The subsidy eligibility quota is the amount of milk which is produced by a producer on which he qualifies to obtain the subsidy from the federal government, but they are not necessarily the same thing. In certain cases the quotas are identical, in other cases they are not.

In effect, there are some farmers who have market sharing quota allocation but do not have the subsidy eligibility quota to go along with it.

What we're trying to do, by this programme and the follow-up programme that we will implement, is to try to help those farmers who are in that predicament, who are selling milk at world prices, when there is no need of it whatever, because they could be selling at the $1.25 subsidy paid by the federal government, as well as the fixed price assured by the Ontario Milk Marketing Board for that category of milk.

In effect, a farmer is being penalized about $3.30 a hundred if he hasn't got sufficient subsidy eligibility quota and the sad part of it is that we have literally millions of pounds of subsidy eligibility quota in Ontario that is not being used. To me, this is basically wrong, in a time when we are—and have been these last few months—short of butterfat, for instance. Canada increased cheese production last year by 15 per cent, but we were just a little short as far as butter production was concerned and it is anticipated that there could be a necessity to increase

industrial milk production or manufacturing next year.

I want to be very sure that Ontario doesn't lose that industry by default to other provinces who are most anxious to get their hands on that subsidy eligibility quota.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the government take any steps to fix the price of the market sharing quota, since the Milk Board does not allow it to be sold at auction? How is the price established?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the subsidy eligibility quota and the quota to which my hon. friend refers are two different things. The quota that is not allowed to be sold at auction sales unless there are some strings attached—and I'm not sure just what they are—is the fluid milk quota that has been selling in the, what, $20-a-pound range?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): More than that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What?

Mr. Gaunt: More than that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, in some cases it has, but it has eased back to around $20. But the subsidy eligibility quota has been selling at a very modest figure—I think about 5 cents a hundred is the most I've heard of it selling at. A farmer could pay for it in his first shipment of milk—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —but I'm afraid they are not aware of the complexities of the situation. What we propose to do with this programme is to use our extension branch people throughout the province, working with Milk Marketing Board people throughout the various counties and districts, to try to acquaint farmers with the opportunity they have to capitalize on this industrial milk market.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister have any discussions with the officers of the chartered banks in Ontario about this guarantee programme?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, we have, we've met with them and the programme has worked out well. That doesn't mean that each bank manager out in the country knows about it yet, but it's been discussed with the officials of the chartered banks at head office.

Mr. Renwick: Well, by way of a further supplementary question, my thought was directed toward another aspect of it: On what basis were the chartered banks unwilling to extend credit to the industrial milk producers in Ontario without the guarantee of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, there's been no thought of that whatever. What we are suggesting to the farmers is that they go to the bank to try to negotiate loans for these quotas. There are a great many producers who have never gone near a bank to borrow any money and we think because they have not established a credit rating, the government's guarantee will assist them to immediately establish a credit rating if indeed they require money to purchase market sharing quotas. It is purely a matter of facilitating the expediting of the programme.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will this programme eliminate all of the problems of shortage of supply for various classes of cheese production?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Speaker, it will not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is there any maximum on this particular loan?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The maximum is associated with the amount of quota that the Canadian Dairy Commission will pay subsidy on, which is 700,000 lb of milk per producer. That's the limit. There is no point in a man buying beyond that because he wouldn't get subsidy out of it anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

PLEA BARGAINING IN ONTARIO COURTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Can he tell the House what instructions he has sent to Crown attorneys with regard to plea bargaining?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am meeting the Crown attorneys next week and I want to speak to them in

person. I have prepared the material and I am going to see them as a group.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Will the minister inform the House of these instructions at an early date following that?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I shall indeed.

HYDRO TRANSMISSION CORRIDOR

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. What disposition has been made of the Premier's (Mr. Davis) promise to certain petitioners that he would review the location of the new hydro line to Nanticoke and Pickering which runs through a number of areas sensitive to the location of those lines?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): As I recall, Mr. Speaker, it is being reviewed, and not solely in relation to the question of location.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the other criteria have to do with alternatives to the high-tension power lines that have come under criticism?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier is putting into the mix, of course, the representations and arguments made on behalf of those who are concerned with the ecology and the aesthetics.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: What matter other than location then would be part of the review? If the line is necessary, then it has got to go somewhere. Does the minister imply in his answer that perhaps the line itself is not necessary?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, I don't, Mr. Speaker. But, as the hon. members will recognize, at this time and under this government input is being required from more than the economists and the engineers in relation to all our energy transportation systems. And I repeat the fact that it is under review because of the input required not only from those sources but from the ecologists.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would it be possible for the minister to obtain interim recommendations from Task Force Hydro on this matter, which of course has implications other than just the location I brought to the minister's attention?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I doubt if it is reasonable, Mr. Speaker, but I will assess it. I think that if we want Task Force Hydro to report within a reasonable time, we would be making a mistake if we pulled them off into ad hoc studies of particular situations. But maybe there is some merit in the question, and I will have it assessed.

CORONERS' ROLE IN INQUESTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further question of the Attorney General: Does he intend to have legislation introduced pertaining to inquests and the role of the coroner in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, that matter comes under my colleague, the Solicitor General, and he would answer that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, might I transfer the question to the Solicitor General?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Would the member repeat the question?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, does the Solicitor General intend to introduce legislation at this session pertaining to the role of the coroner and inquests?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? If not, the spokesman for the New Democratic Party.

SUNDAY CLOSING HOURS

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Attorney General. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation during this session to deal with the Sunday observance early closing hours?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter for government decision. At the present time, it is being studied by a committee of cabinet through various ministries.

Mr. Deans: By way of a supplementary question, has the government paid recognition to the ad hoc committee's submission in regard to the suggestions by the committee of the Law Reform Commisison with regard to expediting this matter as quickly as possible?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Very much so.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. What does the Minister of Labour intend to do in regard to the inadequate level of the minimum wage in the Province of Ontario, recognizing the increase in the cost of living index of 4.5 per cent since the last revision of the minimum wage?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member we are always looking at the minimum wage level. We are presently studying it and I cannot give him a firm commitment at this time of what will be done.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Would the minister agree that it might not be unreasonable to raise it to the federal level or perhaps even beyond that to $2 an hour, recognizing the cost of living in this province?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the cost of living is being considered as well; it is under consideration by the department. I have nothing further to say for the moment.

WINTER WORKS LOAN PROGRAMME

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. Will the Treasurer be making known to the Legislature, prior to it rising for the summer recess, assuming that it does, the plans of the government with regard to an integrated programme of winter works for this coming year to relieve what we anticipate will be perhaps a five per cent level of unemployment?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Sling it to him, Darcy!

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I would doubt that very much, Mr. Speaker. The plan presently is that there are meetings of officials scheduled, I think, for late May or June to assess the adequacy or otherwise of the programmes of last winter. I would think it would be July before the respective levels of government meet together to determine what would be appropriate as contingency planning for next winter.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: In view of the difficulties that arose last year in regard to municipalities taking advantage of the money made available, would the Treasurer be able to give us some information about the timing of the release of the information, in order that municipalities will be able to take full advantage of all of the opportunities during this coming winter?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would think, Mr. Speaker, the information will most certainly be made available at the appropriate time.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: With reference to the provincial Treasurer's observations directed toward the federal government in his representation to the November meeting of the provincial treasurers, when he said that the federal government should be willing to enter into negotiation and agreement with the provinces in accordance with certain guidelines or else the provinces should withdraw and, in effect, hand the whole caboodle over to the federal government, where do we stand on that? Is the Treasurer in the process of negotiating with the federal government? Is he, in effect, saying let's work out a joint programme or else the whole problem is theirs?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Are we still talking about winter unemployment?

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I have already indicated to the House, we are in the process now of assessing the effects of last winter's programmes at all three levels. We will be meeting with them to compare notes and then we will be meeting with them to develop contingency plans if they become necessary. Until we've done all that, I don't think I can answer the member's question.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the federal government responded at all to the Treasurer's minor ultimatum with regard to certain guidelines in the development of programmes, or else?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government at Ottawa has not been noted for its responses.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Bob Stanfield has a real ally in the Treasurer!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer Affairs—

Interjections by hon. members.

NON-RETURNABLE CONTAINERS

Mr. Deans: A question of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, assuming that is his name. Good. Thank you. Will the minister consider introducing legislation that will ban the further introduction of non-returnable plastic containers until such time as the government has made clear its position with regard to non-returnable containers of all types?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this question is obviously for my colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), if he cares to answer it; if he is here. He is not here.

Mr. Deans: No, it is not.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, it is.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): He won't give us a straight answer though.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Wentworth have further questions?

The hon. member for Wellington South.

SALE OF DAIRIES TO U.S. FIRM

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is he aware that in the past five years there have been about 19 dairies that have been taken over by an American firm called Beatrix? Does he feel that there is enough concern in providing some protection for the distributors and the producers, that he should establish some financial aid to these people who own this industry?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, as far as providing assurance to the producer is concerned, that really has no bearing on the issue whatever, because the dairies, as individuals, don't buy milk from the individual producers. They buy it from the Milk Marketing Board and all producers are required to sell milk to the board; so there is no relationship there whatever.

Frankly, with respect to an American company purchasing various dairies, I suppose it has always been the prerogative of businessmen to sell their dairies or any other business they want to sell, if the opportunity presents itself. I suppose that in many cases they have seen fit to dispose of their businesses to a company that is willing to pay them what they ask for it. This is the normal course of doing business in this country. I don't think my hon. friend would want us to step in and say, "Thou shall not sell," if the opportunity presents itself.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

HOLE IN BASEMENT OF HOUSE

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): A question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Has the minister received the report yet as to the source of the hole that appeared in the basement of the Mainville home in Azilda and, if so, what does his information tell him as to what really did cause that hole?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I point out that we do not have an explanation for this particular event. My officials are looking into it and, hopefully, I will have a report in due course.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has the answer to a previous question.

STOCK EXCHANGE COMMISSION RATES

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question raised first by the member for York South and later by the member for Riverdale is as follows:

The matter raised by the hon. members was discussed with Mr. Royce, chairman of the Ontario Securities Commission, who assures me that the proposals, when and if referred to it, will be given a complete and public hearing. At the same time, the Ontario Securities Commission is causing its staff to study the proposals for its own information. The chairman of the commission has assured me that the commission and its members are more than aware of the importance of the small investor in our financial activities.

In addition, I would hope that individuals within this House who have strong feelings on this matter will make such representations to the commission. The commission, however, will not make its ultimate decision based solely on these hearings, but will also consider its own investigations and studies of the situation as well as the overall concern of the government for continued involvement of the small investor in the marketplace.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, will any decision of the Ontario Securities Commission be subject to final review by the government?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I did not say that, of course, Mr. Speaker, but there will be the continued involvement of and consideration of the government's point of view, and I will be responsible for that to the Commission.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

ARNPRIOR DAM

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. In view of the provincial secretary's visit, along with the Premier, in the Ottawa area yesterday; and the fact that at that time no announcement was made in relation to the Arnprior dam on the Madawaska; and in view of the fact that this dam was promised on Oct. 6 prior to the election; and in view of the fact as well that the minister on Feb. 22 said that in two weeks he would have a decision on—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not getting to a question. He has had several "in view of the facts" now. He should get to a question.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the provincial secretary, is it not true that the dam will, in fact, not be built in Arnprior and that this was merely an election promise prior to the election to help the Progressive Conservative in Renfrew South?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What was the question?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The answer is yes.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr Speaker, I think that's a triple negative but the answer is yes and no.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Will the dam be built, yes or no?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: There will be an announcement made in a few days, yes or no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, yes.

Mr. Cassidy: Would the minister now table any reports or studies that have been made by his department or by Hydro on the environmental effects and the economic costs and benefits of the proposed dam near Arnprior?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: These have been studied, but I don't know whether the question of tabling them is that significant. Perhaps, though, when I report on the decision that the government will be making in a matter of a few days, as I said, it would be appropriate. I can assure the hon. members, as I did earlier in reply to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, these ecological questions are now a part of any equation of decision that we come to.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, it doesn't have to be tabled here, but would the minister make the studies public in advance of any announcement so that the public in the area concerned, and throughout the province, can look at the projects and can, in fact, give him their advice as to whether or not they feel it is a good project, rather than this unilateral kind of decision-making which is being discussed now?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker, the ingredient of the ecological impact of the Arnprior dam is minimal. There are other projects we have in the province such as the Onakawana, which I mentioned last week, that have very significant ecological implications, but no one has suggested to me, with regard to Arnprior, that they are anything but minimal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

PROVINCIAL ENUMERATION FOR ASSESSMENT PURPOSES

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Revenue regarding the provincial enumeration of this spring, now abandoned: How much did this wasted enumeration cost the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, of course, there was editorial matter on that. I don't think we agree necessarily that it was wasted and obviously that would have to be a question for the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

ADMISSION OF STUDENTS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities: Is the minister aware that

some of the community colleges in southern Ontario are requesting students from northern Ontario to come down to southern Ontario for an interview before they are admitted to the colleges? If so, does the minister not feel that this is an undue burden being placed on these students, both financially and time wise, and it is not really equality of educational opportunity?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, in view of the intent, purpose and role of the community colleges, which is to serve the community and students within the community, I would assume from the hon. member's question that these institutions are offering courses that are not available in northern Ontario. I would think, under the circumstances, that the mails should be sufficient although, if there are more students applying for a particular course than there is room for, it may be that a personal interview is necessary. This, as the hon. member knows, is within the realm of responsibility of the institution and the board itself.

Mr. Reid: By way of a supplementary: Would the minister not agree that, because the government is providing some $109 million, perhaps the minister could give some direction in this regard because it is discriminatory? Would the minister not agree that either a review committee or an interview committee from these colleges could go to northern Ontario, or the community colleges in northern Ontario could do the interviewing, because it is discouraging students from northern Ontario from taking the courses that they desire?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Again, Mr. Speaker, assuming that they are not available in the north, I would look into that for the hon. member. It would appear, under the circumstances, that a hardship is being imposed by asking them to travel here, particularly if they are not accepted at the institution. I will look into that.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Isn't it a fact, Mr. Minister, that the raise in the students' fees has caused the post-secondary institutions, such as the community colleges to go on a drive for students and they are competing in a most negative way and it is the fear of the community colleges that they will not receive adequate students on the formula financing and that their budgets will be cut next year? Isn't that what is causing this activity?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They need recruiting officers.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There is no implication of that, Mr. Speaker, in the question of the hon. member for Rainy River to me. I would assume that these are courses which are not available locally; therefore, there is not that competition. They want to come down here and take a particular course which is only available in southern Ontario. I am not denying the possibility that there was some notice in a northern newspaper regarding these courses. I wouldn't criticize that.

At the same time, I would also say that I think there is a certain amount of responsibility on the part of the community colleges to have as high an enrolment as possible. They have the facilities, they have the plant; certainly they don't want that facility and plant half empty next fall.

In my opinion, there shouldn't be any great competition between community colleges in the same area offering the same courses. I think it should be mainly restricted to one of information, as the department does from time to time by way of brochure.

Mr. Foulds: One last supplementary then, Mr. Speaker: What action will the department take if it finds there is, in fact, undue competition for students in the same areas between community colleges because the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The question has been asked.

Mr. Foulds: Right.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would suggest that this is something the council of regents would deal with. Proper direction and consultation should be made between the council and respective boards.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Perth.

GOVERNMENT OFFICE BUILDING IN TIMMINS

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): A question of the Minister of Government Services: In a press release which I have in hand, dated May 11, emanating from this minister's office, there was reference made to the placing of advertisements inviting inquiries concerning

a proposed office building in Timmins, which would consolidate six individual premises. I wonder if the minister could advise the House what will be the anticipated dollar savings to be accrued by the government when these six departments will be housed in one premises?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we shall have to wait for the tenders to be submitted and see what the costs of this consolidated office space will be. I am not suggesting that there will be any savings because the reason for the consolidation may not be only a saving in dollars.

The consolidation may be to allow expansion space for the present ministries' offices in Timmins. It may also be to give improved accommodation or better locations, and last but by no means least, will allow for bringing these offices together in one building so they can better serve the public of that community.

Mr. Edighoffer: By way of supplementary: Did the minister read the press release before it was issued?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, I did.

Mr. Edighoffer: By way of another supplementary: Is the minister aware that he stated that there would be substantial dollar savings by the province?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, there may be substantial dollar savings. I explained that may not be the only reason for such consolidations. We cannot say exactly what the dollar savings will be or will not be until we receive the tenders. I might also say that if this consolidation were not to take place, there might be a need for expansion in other locations which would cost additional money, which might be more than what would be involved in consolidation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

TEENAGER SENTENCED TO LASH

Mr. Lawlor: To the Attorney General: Does the hon. minister know about the case of the 16-year-old boy in Hamilton who was sentenced to 10 lashes yesterday by Judge Bennett? Whether or not the minister knows about the case, what is the position of this government with respect to lashing?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I read of that case in the morning paper. It involved, according to the paper, a very vicious attack on a very elderly man; I believe he was about 95 years of age.

Mr. Lawlor: He got 5½ years for that.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The sentence itself is under the Criminal Code, which is, as the member well knows, set by the federal government. It is under the code that the judge would set the sentence, in accordance with the circumstances of the particular case.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister takes no issue then?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

SALE OF FIRECRACKERS

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Attorney General: Since, on April 20, the minister undertook to inform himself, and subsequently the House, on the results of the studies by his department into the sale and use of firecrackers in the province, will he now enlighten us as to the results of these studies?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would. This matter comes under the Explosives Act, which is a federal statute, and it limits the size and strength of firecrackers. There are also provisions under the Municipal Act whereby municipalities themselves can control the sale of firecrackers. The Safety Council has made a study of this matter. There were certain accidents last year, but a relatively minor number, taking into account the number of people, perhaps, who might use firecrackers on special days such as the holiday not far away. Under the circumstances, I think it is up to the municipalities if they wish to take further action. But there have been suggestions, certainly, and from the member—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): For Wentworth.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —acting for the leader of the New Democratic Party, that it should be a province-wide ban. I think that since there is federal legislation under the Explosives Act dealing with it, and there is provision under the Municipal Act, we should leave it at that point. I don't think there should be a province-wide ban.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary: Since the municipalities are pointing out the problem of any effective ban or control by themselves of the use and sale of firecrackers, because of their relatively small geographic size, and the accessibility to firecrackers in adjoining municipalities, would the minister not feel it is incumbent upon the province to investigate the possibility of regional action, or provincial action, to overcome this problem?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think the regional governments might well be given power to put a ban on that if they wished to in their various areas—for example, in the hon. member's area—but other than that I think it should be left as it is.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: How does the minister rationalize his statement today that he doesn't believe there should be any action, with the statement of his colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs on Thursday last, that the government was actively studying the matter?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I didn't have the benefit of hearing my colleague, though I did hear that he made a statement. I don't think he said it was actively being studied; he said he would inquire as to whether we were studying it.

Mr. Deans: Oh, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

GIDON INDUSTRIES STRIKE

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister consider using the persuasive powers of his ministry to cause Gidon Industries Ltd. of Rexdale to begin to negotiate and bargain in good faith with its employees, in so far as they have been on strike for some seven weeks now without a proposal being made by Gidon to the employees, and with Gidon using Canadian Driver Pool and associated companies to truck in strikebreakers to operate the plant?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Windsor West, I would like to assure him that even though there may be some resemblance in the name of the company and the name of the Minister of Labour, there is no conflict of interest whatsoever.

Mr. MacDonald: I would hope not.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I am sure the hon. member will be glad to hear that we've had several meetings with both parties, and as recently as yesterday our chief mediator, Mr. Scott, spoke to the union. The mediation services will then, through his services, try to find a solution to the problem. I think the hon. member is perhaps aware that our Labour Relations Board has given leave to the United Steelworkers to prosecute the company on six charges of unfair labour practices.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING STUDY

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Having regard to the comments the Premier made yesterday to the Canadian Labour Congress, that he wasn't entirely content with the collective bargaining process but it was the best yet devised, I am wondering if he has considered the request I made some time ago for the appointment of a select committee of this Legislature to study the whole question of compulsory arbitration, strikes, lockouts, secondary picketing, contracting out, the erosion of the bargaining unit and all matters of that nature, which I am sure lead to the disenchantment that he expressed.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I recall the member for Sarnia making these observations a while ago. The government is giving consideration to two or three matters, and of course when policy is determined I will be delighted to inform the hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, by way of supplementary, may I request of the Premier that he regard the establishment of a select committee in a more priority fashion, if possible, than that of an independent task force?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

APPEAL OF SENTENCES IN WIRETAPPING CASE

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Has the minister decided to appeal the sentences imposed on Mr. Grange, the president of Canadian Driver Pool, and the police constable, who were involved in the wiretapping incident; and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not decided to deal with that at the present time. I have not given it further consideration in the last few days; I will, but I think I know my decision at the present time.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, as the time for appeal has expired, is the minister saying that he is not going to appeal?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I don't think the time has expired. That's the reason I want to look into it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

PROPERTY TAX ON MOBILE HOMES

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. Will the minister bring an amendment into the House with regard to the Assessment Act to make it legal to tax mobile homes that are no longer mobile but are placed on a permanent foundation so that municipalities can then reap the tax benefits and allow these homes to be used as homes on private land rather than in trailer parks?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, of course, legislation which the government is preparing to bring into this House is a matter of government policy, and it would be highly improper for me to express an opinion as to whether we are going to bring such legislation before the House or not.

An hon. member: That is weak!

Mr. Reid: That is ridiculous! Is the minister aware of the situation?

Mr. MacDonald: The minister won't do anything—we know that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member will know in due course what government policy is in this matter.

Mr. Reid: By way of supplementary, is the minister aware of the situation, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Good: He doesn't know anything about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

An hon. member: Leave now.

DELAY IN EXHUMATION

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker: Can the Solicitor General explain the long delay in replying to Dr. Schreter's request that his son's body be exhumed to explain the discrepancy in the evidence of the autopsy and the inquest?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the most recent communication by me in this matter is a letter dated May 9 to Mr. Chilcott, of the firm of Binks, Chilcott, Lynn and Simpson. I indicated to him that the supervising coroner's office is reviewing the circumstances surrounding this death, and then I went on to say: "It may well be that the office will recommend an exhumation be done, and in that event, of course, you would then have to seek an order of the court to do so." So the matter is under investigation at the present time.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister not aware that unless the exhumation is done within the next few days, it will be too late to determine the necessary things because of the decomposition of the body? And what in the world is taking so long to make up the mind of the supervising coroner?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I was discussing this matter with the supervising coroner, last Friday, I believe, and he knows of my concern in the matter.

Mr. Shulman: As a final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker, will the supervising coroner make his decision known this week?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the supervising coroner will make his decision when he has made a review of all of the facts.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General has the answer to a question asked yesterday.

JUDGE'S STATEMENT IN WINDSOR

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor West directed a question to the Provincial Secretary of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) yesterday concerning a story in the newspaper from Windsor of April 24, with reference to His Honour Judge Stewart. It concerned, if I can read the statement by the hon. member:

> Would the secretary investigate a situation of possible discrimination on the basis

of nationality or racial background in a provincial court judge's statement at Windsor by Judge Stewart, who said he would begin using jail sentences instead of customary fines for Americans caught at the border with marijuana?

I would just like to clarify the situation in that on April 24 there were 18 persons charged under the Narcotic Control Act who came before His Honour Judge Stewart. I have obtained a transcript and I believe of the 18, there were 15 from the United States.

In dealing with at least two of those cases, there were certain references to a substantial amount of marijuana coming into this country from the States and people being caught with it at the border. In one of those statements in these cases he said, "I'm going to start taking a more serious attitude toward this problem, this large influx of marijuana into this country from people from Michigan and other states."

Then, at another point in another case of the same morning, he said to a young lady: "I'm giving you fair warning. If this repeats there are going to be jail terms. Fifteen people coming into this country; keep it in your own country. If you think it's good, keep it over there."

Now, under the provisions of the Narcotic Control Act, on summary conviction for possession the maximum sentence is $1,000 and/or six months in jail. On a second offence it is $2,000 and/or one year in jail. His Honour Judge Stewart had previously given the same warning to people from Windsor that if these cases persisted he was going to start imposing jail sentences, which is within his right and in accordance with the circumstance of the particular trial. I think, under the circumstances, His Honour Judge Stewart acted quite properly.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

ELECTION ACT

Mr. Reid moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Election Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, this bill would limit the amount of contributions of any corporation, union or person, to $1,000 to any candidate in a provincial election. It is really only a vehicle to have a full discussion of the financing of election expenses in the Legislature.

PROVINCIAL COURTS ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to raise the upper age limit of persons who are dealt with as juvenile delinquents by the provincial courts from 16 years of age to 18 years of age.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members of the House the good news from Cornwall, of which I am sure all the members are aware from the sports pages of the daily papers. The Cornwall Royals won the Memorial Cup, quite an honour for a small town in a competition that involved teams from across Canada.

I would also like to point out that Richard Brodeur of the team was awarded the Stafford Smythe Trophy as outstanding player in the league. I am proud of the efforts of the Cornwall Royals. The Memorial Cup has been played for annually since 1919 and this is the first time in 53 years that the Cornwall team has won the championship.

Now that we have a hockey team of whom we can be proud, I would like to see prosperity of a different kind come to Cornwall and the area—healthful economic prosperity that will bring positive results. As the hockey team worked together with officials to win the trophy, so must the people and business work together with your support so that expansion and job openings can bring prosperity to the citizens of Cornwall.

I know the hon. members will join with me in congratulating the Cornwall Royals, their general manager, Jim Larin, their coach Orval Tessier for their success, and at the same time recognize the need for continued team support to put Cornwall, if not at the top, at least into the competition for economic stability.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I understand one of the reasons Cornwall won the championship was that it had two players from Kingston on the team!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, is there any significance in the absence of the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Turner) today? Is he at home in mourning?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. G. Nixon moves second reading of Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF PRESTON

Mr. R. D. Rowe moves second reading of Bill Pr32, An Act respecting the Town of Preston.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

Mr. J. R. Rhodes moves second reading of Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. J. R. Smith moves second reading of Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting the Town of Preston.

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

SURVIVORSHIP ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 84, An Act to amend the Survivorship Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Yes, I'd like to say just a word about the bill before us.

The Survivorship Act involves the situation where two people die simultaneously or so close together it is virtually impossible to tell which one died first. In the circumstances, the Act says that the younger is deemed to have survived the elder, with certain exceptions.

The references were wrong with respect to two pieces of legislation one of which is the Wills Act, which I haven't got before me, but which, in section 36, sets up certain categories such as children, a grandchild, a brother or a sister surviving the testator, leaving issue—and only in that situation leaving children—that he or she surviving will supersede and remain, in effect, carrying the gift through from the predeceased parent over to the grandchild, say, or the children of the brother or sister.

In the other circumstance where, under the terms of the Insurance Act, a beneficiary predeceases a person whose life is insured, then several things may happen. Provided that there isn't any declaration under the terms of the Insurance Act, or if there was a contract in existence, then it is deemed to go to the surviving beneficiary or, if there is more than one beneficiary, to the other ones equally, or if there is none, then back to the estate of the testator, or if he's still alive in the situation, back to him personally, to the insured, or in the event of death, to his personal representative. Of course, in those circumstances he would have to be dead.

It's a nicely complicated piece of law, I think the Attorney General will agree, particularly if he takes into cognizance subsection 3 of section 1 of the Survivorship Act, which sets up another whole host of contingencies and circumstances, but this legislation is in good order. It is a curious thing that references should be made to the wrong sections of the statutes involved, but it is being rectified today.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate in the debate? If not, the hon. minister?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): No, I think there's no further comment warranted.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 89, An Act to amend the Professional Engineers Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 98, An Act to amend the Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

QUIETING TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 99, An Act to amend the Quieting Titles Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 100, An Act to amend the Matrimonial Causes Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

CHANGE OF NAME ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 88, An Act to amend the Change of Name Act.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, this bill has some substantive features about it, unlike the other bills that have gone through and should be commented upon for the record.

It arises out of a report of the Law Reform Commission and particularly a case which caused some serious misgivings in the profession. The case, as set forth in the report, is one that had been put before the commission, in which a woman of non-British nationality obtained a divorce in a foreign jurisdiction.

The foreign courts awarded her custody of infant children of the marriage. Neither the validity of the divorce nor the right to the custody of the children has been disputed in Ontario. The woman married a Canadian citizen and he wishes to raise the children as his own. The woman acquired the new husband's surname by marriage but the children still bear the surname of their father. This causes the family some embarrassment and inconvenience in their daily life and both the husband and the wife wish the children to have the wife's new surname. It was impossible so to do under the wording of the Act as it presently stands.

There was a second major consideration that went into the revamping of this legislation and that has to do with increased recognition in this jurisdiction and the world over of the rights of women. This bill was highly discriminatory. The husband could make applications, without reference to the wife, in a number of circumstances for having his name changed. It was obligatory upon the wife to change hers, along with the children's but it wasn't vice versa. There was no equality in the relationship.

The position of the unmarried woman and the divorcee, the position of the separated woman, were all highly invidious and weighed preponderantly against her, whatever her situation may be, in her desire to change her name for whatever good reasons. All this has been flushed out and is being rectified in the course of rewriting this legislation.

I think the details and the niceties of the changes as set forth both with respect to the several pages of critique that went into the changing of the bill, and the appendix which rewrites the sections fundamentally, and rewrites them in such a way that they

are presently substantially embodied in the new legislation, are all very meritorious matters.

There is no reason particularly why a person must be a British subject, specifically in order to change his name. In a host of other directions, in the business of getting married, for instance, in the business of getting divorced, in the business of appearing before the courts on matters to adopt a child in Ontario, all are available without any advertence to whether or not a person is a British subject. But in this Act it was necessary, in order to make the application to the court, to so state.

Now that has been abolished. Substituted therefor is a very intelligent piece of legislation, based on residence. One year's residence will qualify. It is restricted geographically; the residence for reasons set forth in the report is restrictive to the county or area in which the individual lives, rather than to the whole of Ontario. Again, the reason given for that is that they are known; their reputation is available and bruited abroad in the areas in which they live. If they are changing their name for any invidious purpose, then it would be more likely to come to public attention, and representations would be made against it.

I've always been bemused by one portion of the law in this regard. It seems to me that, without utilizing the formalities of the Act at all, persons are perfectly justified, or at least it is permissible for them, to change their name any time they see fit, provided they are not carrying out any misrepresentation or fraud by so doing. Why they should avail themselves of the terms of the Act is a little beyond me. There may be questions of social policy here; this Act, for instance, says that you may only change your name within the dimensions of the statute, if the clause is read; but there are no penalty provisions or any type of sanction whatsoever for anyone who does so without availing himself of the terms of the Act.

It is a piece of law that has always, as I say, intrigued me a bit as to just what are the ambits of a person's rights to change his name to begin with. I would think that what happens in most of these cases is that people just go about it and alter it without resort to the courts and in this particular may get into difficulties on pension plans and school attendance and a number of other things subsequent thereto in trying to establish real identities; but, leaving that aside, that would be consequent upon the thing and probably many years afterward.

I think that the business of changing names is done fairly often and fairly beneath the clover, so to speak, and the use of this Act is relatively negligible in that particular regard. The present move in revamping the statute and making it easier, particularly for women found in various circumstances, commends itself to this party and is another piece of the good work that is being done generally by law commissions in this province and throughout the world.

I have only one other thought. It may be that I have the wrong section, but the Law Reform Commission recommends the deletion of section 8. It may be the wrong section 8, so to speak. I'm looking at the RSOs 1970 and section 8 has reference to an unmarried mother who marries or a widowed mother who remarries, who may make an application with the consent of her husband, if living, for a change of the surname of her unmarried infant children.

I find this section to be almost ridiculous in the way in which it is set out, and that may be the reason I'm not sure that is the section they are referring to for deletion. Certainly the section doesn't make much sense, because "with the consent of her husband, if living," would apply, if at all, to the unmarried mother but there wouldn't be a husband, hardly, would there, and if living she could hardly be a widow in the second phrase? When reading, I find some difficulty in construing the section and making sense of it, and that may be the reason for the recommendation. I don't know. I would ask the minister to look at it. Perhaps he has been over this with a fine-tooth comb, and maybe the Law Reform Commission means that, and that section 3, subsection 1 as now drawn, is sufficiently wide to encompass that particular situation. Those are all the remarks I have. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate? The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): I would just like to add a bit to what the member for Lakeshore had to say. I think that he hit the nub of the problem, and that is that as far as individuals are concerned, if they choose to have a different name, then for all practical purposes they can. I believe that in normal life their signature will be accepted by a bank, unless it comes to a matter of a major contract and so on, but as far as the application for pension schemes and other

things that are applied by the government they run into severe difficulties.

It is perhaps a bit unfortunate that an attempt wasn't made by the government in drawing up the legislation and in consulting with the report of the Law Reform Commission, to try and consider the changes that have taken place in the attitude of a number of people in the province, especially women, even since the law reform report came down. I can cite a particular instance which has come to my attention, of a married woman who prefers to be known under her maiden name and who now faces the situation of having to pay an additional premium under the Ontario Health Insurance Plan in order to be able to submit claims in her maiden name, which is the name that she uses on all occasions, because the Ontario government will not accept claims which are submitted under that name. They reject them, and therefore her husband has to pay a married premium and she has to pay a single premium should she wish to use her name in that particular regard.

The minister may say that is a small instance, but in fact you can multiply this again and again. I would suggest to him that this is something which is going to continue and it is going to increase, and there is no particular point in this Legislature trying to make judgements about it. It is something which a number of married women in the province, particularly younger ones, are latching on to as a means of demonstrating their continued independence and that they have not, through marriage, become subservient in any way whatsoever to their husbands.

It is unfortunate that the Act, in so far as it affects this—and obviously it doesn't get to the basic principle, which is that in law the name of a woman does change through marriage—does not leave any kind of an out. In this particular case it does not open, for example, the option of one spouse changing his name while the other spouse decides not to change his or her name. It states here that should they get into those circumstances they would in effect be frustrated, because if they are living together then one spouse could block the other's desire to change her name by not consenting to change the second spouse's name. Even if the wife agreed with the husband's changing his name but did not wish to change her own, that would not be possible under this particular legislation. I would urge the minister to take account of the fact that in law there should be means by which a couple can preserve their two names legally, and not just through custom, and therefore not get into the kind of problems that are created by the existing law.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Bales: In replying to the question raised by the hon. member for Lakeshore, the sections as referred to in the bill are those in the RSOs 1960, and under that circumstance section 9 was 8, etc., and so it has been dealt with.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves second reading of Bill 113, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves second reading of Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 84, An Act to amend the Survivorship Act.

Bill 88, An Act to amend the Change of Name Act.

Bill 89, An Act to amend the Professional Engineers Act.

Bill 98, An Act to amend the Judicature Act.

Bill 99, An Act to amend the Quieting Titles Act.

Bill 100, An Act to amend the Matrimonial Causes Act.

Bill 113, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Act.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, His Honour waits to give assent to certain measures.

ROYAL ASSENT

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 76, An Act to amend the Operating Engineers Act.

Bill 78, An Act respecting Ontario Credit Union League Ltd.

Bill 84, An Act to amend the Survivorship Act.

Bill 88, An Act to amend the Change of Name Act.

Bill 89, An Act to amend the Professional Engineers Act.

Bill 91, An Act to amend the Municipal Affairs Act.

Bill 92, An Act to amend the Local Improvement Act.

Bill 98, An Act to amend the Judicature Act.

Bill 99, An Act to amend the Quieting Titles Act.

Bill 100, An Act to amend the Matrimonial Causes Act.

Bill 101, An Act to amend the Regional Municipality of Niagara Act.

Bill 102, An Act to amend the District Municipality of Muskoka Act.

Bill 108, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Bill 113, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Bill 114, An Act to amend the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Act.

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting the Town of Preston.

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Mr. A. K. Meen, in the absence of Hon. Mr. McKeough, moves second reading of Bill 77, An Act respecting Municipal Elections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, my party approves of this bill in principle, but there are certain aspects that I would like to discuss in the House here, with the intention of moving amendments, because I think that they're rather important points. And I must confess that there is a diversity of opinion, probably on both sides of the House, on these questions that I will discuss this afternoon.

First of all, on the question of the biennial term, I feel that perhaps this is a very popular thing with the public, because politicians, as a general rule, are in not good repute with the public, and probably they'd like to get their hands on the people that they elect more often than they have an opportunity to now. But I really don't believe that this should be the test as to whether the present three-year term should be reduced to two.

I remember when I began to run for municipal office there was a one-year term, and when I look back at that now I just wonder how we ever lived with that. You

no sooner got through your election and before you could even learn where the washrooms were, let alone learn how the affairs of state were run at city hall, you were back electioneering again.

In the case of members of council who are running in Metropolitan Toronto, to give you an example, because that is the example with which I am most familiar, you have heard from me before and you will hear from me again, stating the obvious facts that the population of Toronto today is larger than the populations of seven of the provinces; that the budgets of Metropolitan Toronto today, both capital and current, are bigger than the budgets of seven of the provinces.

Nobody purports to delimit the term of office for the members of Legislatures like Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Manitoba, Alberta – you know them all. Here, under these circumstances, with these heavy responsibilities that these municipal councillors have, including the members of their executives and the mayors thereof, you choose to limit their term from three years to two years. And I say, why? In the instances of wards in Toronto—and I would imagine the same thing applies to cities like Ottawa and Windsor—some of the wards have as many people in them as we have in our provincial constituencies. Of course, our constituencies vary, as you've heard from the hon. member for—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Yorkview.

Mr. Givens: —Yorkview (Mr. Young), on at least two or three occasions, and you read the article he wrote on how they vary in numbers. There are wards in the city which have 60,000 or 70,000 voters—indeed, some of them have more than that, I believe—and it's a pretty expensive proposition to have a person run every two years. I think it's rather absurd. But the most important point that I would like to make on this particular question is this; any term of office that you can conjure up is arbitrary by its very nature—what is the optimum term, one year, two years, three years, five years?

Pick a number from one to five; it can't be more than five, because the federal term is only five years by the constitution—but I think the term should be long enough that you can initiate some programme of activity, or some measure to be able to initiate it and carry it out, during that term of office. And I say with great respect, sir, that this is impossible to do where the term is only two years. To give you one outstanding example on the matter of rezoning, which I am sure my hon. friend is very familiar with because he participated in municipal activity: Let us say a man is elected to office. An application is made for rezoning in his area, let us say in May or June of that particular year, let us say it is the year 1973. By the time the application is made, by the time it is referred to the planning board and referred back to the committee and then to the executive, and then to council and then to the Municipal Board, and then back from the Municipal Board to the council for the final approving of the bill—

An hon. member: Provided the minister doesn't get involved.

Mr. Givens: Provided the minister doesn't get involved, as one of my colleagues reminded me, and that is so true. A two-year term is not sufficiently long for the purposes of carrying that out. I don't care how you feel about rezoning applications, whether you are in favour of them as a general rule or whether you are opposed to them as some people are becoming sort of pathologically opposed to everything that is put before them now. But whether you are in favour or you are opposed, you should have an ample period of time in which you can initiate either the proposal or opposition to the proposal and still hope to be around when that proposal comes to fruition or where you prevent it from coming to fruition.

That, with great respect, I think is the test; that is the measurement whereby you should determine how long the term should be. If, indeed, that appplies to Metropolitan Toronto, as I am convinced it does from my personal and long experience, then I think ipso facto it should prevail in other municipalities, particularly of the size of Ottawa, Windsor, Sarnia and all the other cities of at least over 100,000 people. I really don't know how you make a difference between them and the smaller municipalities. But municipal government today, just as government here, sir, has become so complex and so complicated and so involved that it is humanly impossible for a man or a woman to be elected to public office today and hope to do a proper job within the framework of a two-year period.

I think the question we should ask ourselves is not whether we ingratiate ourselves with the public by exposing our municipal officials to the two-year term, because if you are going to continue to think of them as

bush-leaguers, all the kinds of candidates you are going to get are bush-league candidates. I see no reason why their term should be any shorter than the term that we enjoy here.

I would appeal to the assistant to the minister that, for the sake of good government, this should be changed to the three-year term for the reasons that I have indicated. I think it should apply to all municipalities in the Province of Ontario because, as I pointed out, business has become so complicated and complex no person can learn the job and carry out his responsibilities in a term which is less than two years.

We all talk about being responsible and responsive to our electors. I think it is possible to be a little over-responsive to your electors. I think there should be an opportunity where you can think and size up the situation and use your judgement. You shouldn't have to run to the telephone every other day to find out how people are thinking on block 10. I think only in that way can you exercise your knowledge, your training and your experience in a proper way for a better government for local municipalities throughout the province. Those are my views.

I think the assistant to the minister knows that I have practised that principle in my own political life over and over again, perhaps sometimes to my detriment, but always with a sense of responsibility and a sense that this is the way a public official should be able to react. Otherwise, don't have municipal governments; get a computer and have people telephone in as to how you should react on this, that and the other thing. I think that would be wrong. Maybe we are coming to that, but I don't think that would lead to good government. So, those are my views on the two-year term. I am agin it. I think it is wrong, again, for the reasons that I have indicated.

The second point I wish to talk about is section 64, having to do with proxy voting. I don't like this matter of proxy voting; I have an inherent, instinctive feeling against it and I will tell you why. In areas that are relatively stable from a physical standpoint, areas that don't change demographically, population-wise—and probably this applies more to rural or semi-rural areas than it does to a big city like Toronto—everybody knows everybody. Everybody knows Joe and John down the block and so on. It's relatively unusual for a person to be able to get away with any kind of chicanery and the proxy system may be okay. But in a big city—and more of our people are gravitating toward the big cities. You know of the studies as well as I do; prolific studies done for the federal government, which show that 80 per cent of the population of this country will be gravitating to the cities of over 100,000 by the turn of the century. Indeed, by the turn of the century it will probably be about 90 per cent.

You have a transient kind of population, particularly in the highrise buildings where there is nothing longer than a three- to five-year lease and people really don't know anybody or one another. People live in the same highrise building and don't know the guy next door.

Under those circumstances—I'm not saying that person should be deprived of a vote; he should be allowed to vote—but what I am suggesting is that a proxy system lends itself to forgery, to misrepresentation and to impersonation. For those reasons, I say, who needs it?

You talk about the students, God bless them, and about people who are incapacitated. I don't think the proxy system is going to work that out and I defy anybody to tell me, having experienced the proxy system in the past provincial election, how you can avoid the kind of abuses I'm talking about. When documents are passed around that have to be signed and have to be vouched for and have to be sworn for, and an oath has to be taken and so on and so on, I don't think the system is good.

I think a person should have to appear and provided you have provided for an advance poll of a long enough duration—maybe two days isn't enough—as long as you have an advance poll that's made possible for a period of days, the person should be able to show up. Even though you don't know him, there is a much smaller possibility that a person is going to impersonate him if he has to appear personally than if he can be lying in bed or being a student somewhere, and having himself impersonated possibly, without his knowledge. This is what I am concerned about—without his knowledge.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It is better if he knows he is being impersonated.

Mr. Givens: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Cassidy: It is better if he knows.

Mr. Givens: Oh, no! I say if a person appears and he happens to be impersonating, at least you can come to grips with him.

But if you do it in the form of a document, which prima facie, you have to judge from the signature on that document, it's much easier to impersonate in that manner than it is to impersonate in person. That sounds like a contradiction in terms but I think you know the point I am trying to make. Proxy voting is something that fills me with considerable apprehension as to what it can lead to.

Thirdly, on the question of multiple voting, I have always been opposed to multiple voting. I could never understand, when we had nine wards in Toronto—we have 11 wards now—why a person should be able to vote in 11 wards simply because he owns property in 11 wards or because he is a tenant in 11 wards. The only kind of a tenant he has to be is to have two rooms and cook. Under the Assessment Act he has to be assessed for $400 and the rule of thumb at city hall has always been that he has to have two rooms and cook.

Why should he be able to vote 11 times? You don't permit the corporation to vote. The corporation can't vote at all; it can be a multimillion-dollar corporation and all it can vote on is money bylaws but it cannot vote multiply. I don't think anybody else should be permitted to vote multiply.

I think the vote should attach to the person as a personal right and not to his bank account or his money bags or to the deeds of property that he happens to own in more than one ward. I don't see why this cannot be enforced and I don't know why you persist in continuing this farce—because that is what I consider it to be—by which a person who owns property or who is a tenant in property in several wards can vote several times. I don't think this is fair and I don't think it is democratic. I don't think it is right.

On the question of by-elections I think section 89 is a good section you have put in. But I don't think it is a good idea! I think it is a good idea in Toronto where we have suffered from this sort of thing but I don't think it is a good idea for any municipality where members of the council are elected at large.

Why should you have to have a by-election especially when you have a two-year term when you have a score of candidates running for office over the whole area at large, as we describe it. To have to have a by-election under those circumstances in a city, let us say, like Galt, with a population of about 60,000, I don't think that is fair or meaningful or that it carries out the spirit of what the minister is trying to do—and I think we all understand what he is trying to do.

Since the bill specifies a two-year period and it is not going to permit a by-election within six months of the election day anyway, why have by-elections? I think you can readily differentiate between municipalities that have a ward system, where a by-election should be permitted under the circumstances envisaged in this bill, and the situation I have described to you, where you have a city where a score of candidates run at large.

It is the easiest thing in the world to pass a section that says to pick the runner-up in that particular instance. But to have a by-election under those circumstances is expensive, unwieldy and, I think, an exercise in uselessness. I don't think it is very smart at all and I think the minister should differentiate between those two cases.

The final point that I wish to address myself to is this matter of how the voters' lists are compiled. I suggest with great respect, and notwithstanding the denials on the part of the three ministries among which the assessment problem has been distributed—namely the Treasurer and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough) and the Attorney General (Mr. Bales)—notwithstanding their protestations to the contrary, they are away behind in their assessment programmes in just about every municipality in the Province of Ontario.

Indeed, I am told on pretty good authority, and I will probably discuss this at another time, that some municipalities are going to have a terrible time this year in coming with their final tax bills because they are being held up somewhere between these three departments—I haven't been able to put my finger on it—because the tapes are away behind and they are having trouble correcting them. But these municipalities are having a tough time coming up with their final tax bills. This isn't simply a matter of administration, this is a matter where some of the municipalities are going to have to go to the banks and borrow millions of dollars and pay heavy interest rates because of this foul-up somewhere in between these three departments.

Coming back to the point that I want to make about the election lists, they are going to be compiled by the assessors; and I am suggesting that these lists will be far behind on the very day they are issued. I think we should adopt the recommendations made by the Toronto city council and, I believe, by

the select committee on election laws in April 1971, that the names of resident electors be obtained by enumeration, as they are in provincial and federal elections, so that they are reasonably up to date; and that the names of non-resident electors should be determined from the municipal assessment rolls as they are being determined now.

We would then have a more updated system, a more current system, one that is fairer than the one we have now, and one whereby we would avoid this nonsense in every election that I ever participated in of people who come in angry as the dickens that their name has been left off the voters' list even though they have been living on this property for 10, 15 or 20 years.

These are the points that I wish to make on this Act, Mr. Speaker, and again I repeat that our party is not opposed to the Act in principle but I would like to see these particular provisions changed in accordance with the remarks I have made and for the reasons I have given.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of comments to make about this bill. We will support it, but I must confess I find it rather difficult to support. I am sorry to have to say that to the minister's representative, because in fact there were some very good recommendations that came from the select committee on election laws and it is a pity that, having confronted those principles, the government has backed down and has not gone even as far as this unanimous report of the select committee had gone.

In addition, I think it is a pity the government failed to grasp the nettle on a number of very important questions that affect elections generally and municipal elections specifically, and that it did not exercise some leadership in going beyond the report of the select committee.

I'll mention briefly the areas I want to cover and then I'll come back to them more specifically.

One is the two-year term, where I suspect we in this party may well find ourselves supporting the government while the government itself beats a hasty retreat. I would very much urge the government not to beat a retreat and not to heed the kind of pressures which are coming in from certain municipalities at this time.

Secondly, there is the question of the franchise. The government has chosen to keep a number of other undemocratic principles in the franchise. A very important and necessary and long overdue step could have been made in favour of the hundreds of thousands of immigrants to Canada who live in our major cities; and the government has failed to grasp that particular one.

The third one, Mr. Speaker, is the issue of multiple voting and the fact that the government has refused on a number of counts and in a number of ways to settle for one man, one vote, at municipal elections; but they have copped out on that principle.

Fourth is the question of by-elections. I am open to an assurance by the parliamentary secretary that there may be further legislation in future; but this bill is quite unsatisfactory.

Fifth is the question again relating to the democratic structure of the larger cities and their responsiveness to the electorate; the need to build into this or some other Act—and this is a perfectly good place to do it—a requirement for a ward system rather than the present optional provisions of the Municipal Act.

Sixth is the question of campaign expenses at the municipal level, which should be handled anyway. This possibly should be uppermost in the government's mind as well, because of the two-year term and the objections that some municipal politicians have raised that it is too costly for them to campaign every two years.

Seventh is the question of the date of voting. The government has stayed true to tradition without, we believe, looking at the problems of campaigning in the month of November; and the advantages of changing the election date, as we propose and will propose in committee, to the first Sunday in November.

Then I have a few specific things that I will raise in relation to voting procedures, and so on; some of which are consequential on the change of the voting date, and others which are more technical and may be raised also on committee as well as during the discussion in principle.

Let me come back to the question of the two-year term. I had some very interesting correspondence about this one from one of my municipal friends, a Toronto alderman. He put the issue very succinctly, saying:

> Every politician I know is in favour of the three-year term, but somehow the voters don't want to let us have it.

And I am glad the government has accepted that point of view, or at least has accepted it as far as the bill has gone thus far; because I think that is a very cogent statement of the problem that is raised by the three-year term.

I can sympathize with the kinds of arguments that were raised by the member for York-Forest Hill in saying that there might be certain questions of continuity, and that government is getting more complex, and this kind of thing; and therefore we should have a three-year, or maybe even a four-year term.

Certain theoreticians in my own party have suggested that municipal governments should have a four-year term; these are in discussion papers that they have put forward. But the fact is that municipal government does not have the sufficient trust from the electorate that it deserves to have the three-year experiment, which came in only a few years ago, embodied and enshrined in legislation on a permanent basis.

I think that the minister and the government should be saying to the multitude of municipal politicians who will be coming to see them, and knocking on their doors, and coming to appear before the legislative committee when, as I hope, this goes out to committee—I see a nod from the parliamentary secretary that it will go out to committee—in order that we can hear directly from people who are concerned.

I think that the government should tell them that they will have to earn the trust of the electorate before this government, or for that matter an NDP government, would be prepared to give a three-year term; even in selected instances such as the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton or the region of Niagara.

I would suggest, in supporting the government on this particular thing, that in fact they are turning the clock back—and I think wisely so. There has been an interesting and curious and very distressing and frustrating development take place in municipal government over the last few years. I know the parliamentary secretary is aware, as the government must be aware, of a growing interest and concern in municipal government on the part of citizens, on the part of residents, on the part of ratepayers, which after all has an enormous impact on their daily lives.

Just at the time that people begin to wake up that there is a bunch of guys down at city hall who have got a pretty important influence over their lives, and just as they begin to find means of organizing in communities, or through their ward or something like that, in order to influence, or maybe even control, or maybe, God forbid, take over city hall, they find an action by this government which takes the prize away from them.

I have seen an example in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and I am sure that people from Muskoka or from Niagara could say the same thing, that just at the point when their local municipalities were beginning to be within reach of people who felt genuinely concerned, suddenly there was created a regional system and they found that the old crowd that used to run city hall somehow landed up in control of the regional city hall and was still running things and was still quite immune from their responsibility to relate, to talk, to influence and be influenced by the voters whom they planned to represent.

That the three-year franchise be changed from one- to a two-year and then from a two- to a three-year franchise was a reflection of this development and the fact is that a three-year franchise is very frustrating for citizens who want to try to hold their representatives at the municipal level accountable, because they vote the guy in and then for 2½ years there is very little they can do to influence him. He just shrugs his shoulders and shakes his head and laughs at them because he is that kind of a politician and the very sad and unfortunate comment about municipal politics in Ontario is that for all of the very good people that have come out of that level of government, we have an awful lot of old fogies as well who don't understand what is happening in this province at this time in history and who, in fact, do not understand the new stirrings that are taking place at the municipal level among citizens and among ratepayers.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): They may feel we don't understand.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, it seems to me that the best way we can show that we understand it is to give them an input. But they are telling us, at least this is what I get, that they don't trust their politicians long enough to leave them in there for three years.

I would urge the minister and the parliamentary secretary to make no exceptions at all to the two-year rule and to tell anybody who comes to object, whether it is Ab Campbell, Dennis Coolican or the controller from the city of Ottawa, with whom he happens

to share some duties, that when they earn the trust, maybe then they can have a three-year term, but not before.

This question of the franchise, Mr. Speaker, leads me to a second point where we find enshrined in this legislation the continuation of the discrimination between British subjects and other immigrants to Canada despite, as I recall, the fact that this was against the recommendation of the select committee.

The government did not decide, as it might have, to restrict the franchise to Canadian citizens, although we would have found that hard to accept as well, nor did it go consistently in the other direction and state, as we believe should be the case, that any landed immigrant in Canada who has made that kind of commitment to this country should have the right to vote. No, it kept the provision under which a British subject, a visitor to this country who had absolutely no commitment to this country but who was simply passing through on his way from London to New Orleans, would be entitled to vote.

I am sorry the select committee refused to grant that one but they stated that he had to be a British subject as well. We disagree fundamentally with that point of view.

We feel that as the level of government closest to the citizens, the municipal franchise should in fact be enlarged to include that very large group which is now excluded; and those are people who, like the British before them, have made a great commitment to this country and are landed immigrants.

The member for York East knows that in the major cities, such as Toronto, Hamilton, Sudbury, Ottawa and so on, there are very large numbers of people who were disenfranchised for a very long period of time because of the existing law and, if this proposal stands, because of the proposed law. It takes a newcomer to Canada, in theory, a little over five years to become a citizen, but we have to accept the fact that it can take longer, through no fault particularly of the newcomer, but simply through the fact that it takes time to learn the way that that particular procedure works; or for that matter, that someone who has made a commitment to this country by coming here, may not wish to abandon immediately every tie to his or her homeland.

The work that is done by the municipal governments hardly bears on the great affairs of state. Canada's foreign policy is not determined by municipal governments. Canada's defence policy is not dealt with by these governments. Municipal government deals with decisions that are very close to home for people who live in cities. Road works and expressways, for example, public transit, municipal planning and zoning, the quality of local schooling, new recreation facilities, these are the gutsy decisions that are taken day by day by municipal government, and these decisions often hit particularly hard at older, downtown areas where so many immigrants settle when they come to Canada. Ethnic groups are poorly represented on Ontario's municipal councils, and the interests of this large group of ratepayers or taxpayers are frequently ignored because they are prevented from exercising a franchise.

I would suggest to the minister that not only is the extension of the franchise to landed immigrants justifiable because of the importance of municipal government in their day-to-day lives, and because they live in areas that tend to be under-represented or badly represented under the existing system, but that it would also, in fact, be a very valuable and very generous kind of gesture on the part of this government and this province toward the one-third of the population of Ontario which is not of British or French extraction.

And it would serve, I would suggest, during the three or four years that might occur between a vote exercised by a landed immigrant and the time that he was able to vote at provincial or federal elections, as a kind of exercise in citizenship in his or her new land, which, in fact, is closed off to him right now. What really better way can one see to educate new Canadians to the ways of this country than to begin at the local level, which is the most fundamental and elementary level of our government? By the time they become citizens they would be fully qualified to participate in federal and provincial politics in a way that they really are not right now.

The member for York East (Mr. Meen) is aware of the inadequacies of citizenship courts and the whole citizenship process. It takes 10 minutes; you answer a few questions about who Pierre Trudeau is and who John Diefenbaker is and that is about it. A perfunctory knowledge of Canada is required in most citizenship courts. But landed immigrants who settle on a particular street in a particular community — and who have obviously had similar situations in cities in their homelands—can very quickly become qualified to judge on the issues which are of importance to their community; whether a

school in their community should or should not have special programmes, let us say for kids like their own kids; what kind of recreation programmes, and something as simple as whether or not there should be soccer in the school programme, or whether the municipal recreation programme caters sufficiently for adults of varying interests and tastes. These are things over which quite clearly landed immigrants are quite as well qualified, if not better qualified, because they have taught us so many more things in this province in the last 25 years than even our own citizens.

If the government finds this argument difficult to accept, then the only thing I can say to the member for York East and to the minister, who is regrettably absent, is that, for God's sake, if you can't give a franchise to people who uprooted themselves and their families and who have committed themselves to a new country, 3,000, 4,000, 10,000 miles away from their homeland; if you can't have that generosity and that libertarian citizenship, then why do you give it to British subjects, to any person who happens to come out of the British Isles or a Commonwealth country and who may, in fact, be simply a bird of passage coming through this country?

This is the point at which I say some of my best friends are British subjects. My wife happens to be a British subject who has so far refused to take out Canadian citizenship, in fact. I am suggesting that she should probably be disenfranchised until I can teach her the error of her ways. If the minister will not go along with the suggestion that we in this party make, then there is no sense and no consistency in the government's present position. While we would differ ideologically if the vote was confined only to Canadian citizens, the present position is untenable. We urge you very strongly to bring in the vote for landed immigrants to Canada.

It was suggested when we discussed this that maybe landed immigrants should have this right only after residency in Canada for one year. That is a nicety which I would leave to the government. Our own feeling is that it is really not necessary in that the commitment to the country is made when a person says, "Yes, I will be a landed immigrant."

Over the six months to a year during which they prepare to sell their house and their automobile, and pack up their household effects, they avidly read the beautiful multicoloured brochures about Ontario sent them by the Ontario government and they are preparing all along. By the time they come to Canada—they have read the letters from their relatives, if they had relatives who preceded them—they know a great deal about this country. In three or four months' time, which would be about the earliest that they would have the right to vote after their arrival in a very theoretical sense, they would be ready. For the few who would not be ready, the chances are that, if not ready, they would not vote, because it takes people time to understand and, if they don't understand, they will not vote.

So, I hope that the government listens very seriously on that particular point and, in fact, agrees with the amendment that we will put forward in committee stage to extend the franchise to immigrants. I might say to the member for York East, he can have it for his own, and if he wishes to propose it for himself we would happily support a measure which would simply substitute the words "landed immigrant" for "other British subject" in the relevant part of the bill.

To return to the democratic or the undemocratic features of the bill, I am very perplexed at the decision of the government to retain multiple voting, to retain corporate voting and to retain separate voters' lists on money bylaws. All of these are anachronisms that are totally unjustifiable, given the basic intent of this bill, which is to give a democratic franchise at the municipal level that is similar to the provincial franchise. It was the guiding theory or the guiding principle behind the select committee's report, that the municipal franchise should be as close as possible to the provincial franchise.

Now we on this side of the House will preside with the member for York East and the government over the burial of the Municipal Franchise Extension Act and all the other provisions that were made that grudgingly and gradually extend the franchise. We will preside over that burial with great pleasure, but we hate to see the skeletons that the government has left in the bill and we don't find them justifiable at all.

Can the minister really explain why it is that a person who does not reside in the municipality should have any right to reside in that municipality? Does he really believe that the rights of property—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Say that again.

Mr. Cassidy: Can the minister or his parliamentary secretary explain to us why a

person who does not reside in the municipality should have any right to vote in that municipality? He can explain it through history. He can go back to the days when the municipal franchise was based on property, but he would agree with me that the provincial franchise is in no way related to property. If one is a Canadian citizen and is a resident of the province for a certain period of time and is of a certain age, one has the right to vote in this province and there are very few exceptions to that rule.

Here, the minister and the government are suggesting that there should be exceptions for which we simply cannot see any defence. We really cannot. I just can't. Nobody says that IBM or General Motors in Oshawa or any other corporations which do business in this province should be entitled to a vote. Nobody says that the absentee owners of American subsidiaries in this province should have a vote. Nobody says that a Quebec doctor or other Quebec resident who happens to own property in the Province of Ontario should have provincial franchise. So why on earth do it at the municipal level?

If you do it at the municipal level—which we do not accept; we reject—why would you then go further and entitle an individual to vote four, five, six, eight or 10 times at the municipal level, if by accident or by design he has a vote, because he has property—owns or rents property—in the relevant number of wards. I simply find no defence for it whatsoever.

As citizens in this provincial democracy of ours, we are all equal at least once and that is when we vote. Certain of us, for example, the members of this Legislature, have more ability to influence the decisions made by this province because we are put here. Other people, by reason of their repute in the community, their ability and their talents or their access to power through wealth or through being at the head of a large industrial concern also have more than equal influence on the decisions which are taken by this province. When it comes down to the vote, their vote counts the same as anybody else's and we don't see why that shouldn't be the case at the municipal level.

When you come to the question of money bylaws, the situation becomes even more ludicrous. Many of the issues over which money bylaws are passed are, in fact, for services to people, as the minister is aware. Recreational facilities, for example, consume a great amount of money right now. The payment for the debentures issued under a money bylaw, if I understand the law correctly, are paid not just by the owners of land and people with leases of over 21 years or whatever the relevant period happens to be. They are paid equally in the taxes by every tenant and by every owner within the boundary of that particular municipality.

Having taken some steps, and I admit the steps that have been taken are positive, to make the franchise democratic, why then should the government decide that on money bylaws it will go back to the position where half of the population of larger cities, such as Ottawa and Toronto, would not be able to vote because they would be on short-term leases and would therefore be ineligible, and then bring in this redundant and anachronistic and really useless provision to give corporations a vote on the money bylaw?

The member for York East knows perfectly well that the corporate vote, even in the limited franchise for money bylaws suggested here in the bill, is of very marginal significance because vrey few corporations will in fact take the trouble. And I just cannot see why he leaves in this anachronism.

I have heard threats—and I think the minister should be aware of them, because in fact if this bill were passed in its present form I am afraid that I would have little trouble myself in exploiting the immorality and the undemocratic nature of the bill in the form proposed by the government in order to influence municipal elections.

I have heard threats in this city that if a bill goes through in this form, which permits a franchise to non-resident owners or tenants of property, people will set themselves up in corporations. There is then the delightful thought of a firm called Municipal Electoral Consultants Ltd., which might have 1,000 or 1,500 or 2,000 partners, and they would own a $20,000 bungalow in each ward of the city of Toronto. They would hire out their services to any candidate who wished to have some advice on the conduct of the election in his particular ward.

Under the present Act, there is a flaw in that and it is that with a $20,000 bungalow you can't get more than about 10 or 15 partners because there is a lower limit to the amount of assessment that has to pertain to each partner. I don't see that lower limit in this bill here and if it is not contained somewhere else, then in fact the minister has opened the door wide to the most flagrant abuses of municipal election procedures this province has ever seen at any time in its history.

If people choose to confront the government on that issue by exploiting that enormous loophole, then I would wish the government bad luck on it and I suggest they would then have to do what they should be doing right now and remove this question of non-resident franchise and a multiple franchise in any municipality.

This brings me to a specific question which has been raised, and that is the question of cottagers, because they are the one group of non-residents for whom I can feel any sympathy. In fact, I tried to suggest to some of my friends that possibly their plight was worthy of an exception to the stand that we take in this party, that there should be no vote for non-residents.

However, I have thought about this very seriously; we have discussed it at length in my party, and we are asking the government to be consistent in applying the democratic principle. That would mean, Mr. Speaker, that we would ask them also to exclude cottagers, as non-residents. In other words, no non-residents should be entitled to vote. Then, in effect, we should tell cottagers that should they be subject to unfair treatment in the municipality where they have their cottage, there is in fact still recourse available to them under a democratic franchise and a democratic Act.

It is very simple. The Act states a definition for residents—a slight trimming might be needed, but basically the option is available in the Act, as it stands right now, for someone who is permanently resident in a cottage area over the summer to show that as his residence rather than his home in the city.

Therefore, if a group of cottagers—and I am aware there have been circumstances like this—feel that they are being exploited by a bunch of wily bumpkins, who were ripping them off for everything they got and not providing adequate services—and this can happen, I suppose, or at least it theoretically can happen—it remains open for those cottagers to decide that they will cast their votes in the rural municipality where they have the second residence, rather than casting their vote from their city residence.

That option, we believe, should remain open. In other words, they would then become technically non-resident in the city, because they have declared their residency to be in the country but they could not vote. And no person in Ontario, we believe, should be able to vote in more than one place at each biennial municipal election. I think that would at least provide an out for the problem of the cottagers, which of course is a more difficult problem to deal with than some of the others.

We are glad to see that the advance polling provision in effect does make allowance if cottagers choose to so organize, and we think the minister might possibly look at some special treatment in terms of enumeration in cottage areas in order to take count if a group of cottagers wanted to organize because of some severe injustices being wreaked upon them.

The next point I want to deal with, Mr. Speaker, is the question of by-elections—and I haven't consulted the government. I suggest that in fact it is up to them to indicate to this House, perhaps in a slightly better manner than the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has been able to in the past, what they intend to do and what their intentions are rather than leaving us to this Russian roulette that we play every day legislation comes forward.

I want to deal with the question of by-elections, because I think it is very inadequately dealt with here in this bill. The principle of the bill is that if a new election is required under this Act or some other Act, then it can be held. But there is no mandatory provision, in fact there is not even a discretionary provision, which allows municipalities to choose to hold by-elections where there are vacancies.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and my party takes the view, that we have grown up in Ontario to the point where the responsibilities of municipal government are serious and important enough that it can no longer be treated as a cosy club. Now, I am sure the minister and the member for York East know better than I do the history of the development of local government in the days when there were a few justices of the peace making some pretty elementary decisions about whether or not to clear a few roads back at a time when the roads in fact weren't that important because everybody travelled by water.

Back in those days municipal government perhaps could be run as a club, but now let's accept the fact that there are some real and fundamental divisions of principle and some real debates within municipal governments, and it is not sufficient to give to a group that is in control of city hall, or a regional council, the right to appoint one of their friends to the club.

I am sure that the parliamentary secretary is aware of this problem that exists within municipal government. It acts too much like a club; that is one of the reasons why people don't want it to have the three-year term. I have already touched on that point, but I suggest it is one of the reasons why by-elections in fact should be mandatory in cities, towns and municipalities above a certain size.

Our suggestion on this side of the House would be that a size of maybe around 15,000 would be in order. To accompany that there should also be a requirement, again in the interests of democracy, that cities and towns above that size should not be permitted to have at-large elections which tend to over-represent certain groups in a community and underrepresent and discriminate against other groups in the community.

If you want, Mr. Speaker, I can give you an example of an at-large election in the city of Ottawa, which of necessity I know best, for the board of education. Out of 12 or 13 members who represent the school voters in the city of Ottawa, all but one come from prosperous middle- and upper-class suburban areas, and the one who lives at all close to the downtown core, lives in much the most prosperous end of that downtown core. It happens to be a pretty good school board.

We happen to be lucky that they are concerned citizens, but at the same time it does not satisfy me and does not satisfy many people that a group of people should represent them because of an at-large election, who may or may not, by transference, if you will, have the interests of the poorer, less vocal, less privileged members of that particular community at heart. We all know that there have been circumstances where that has not taken place. I am sure the secretary is aware, for example, of the zoning problems in the town of Pelham right now, where groups are in fact being actively discriminated against by an old guard or by an old club, and citizens are finding it very difficult.

This is why we in this party believe that this legislation should not only contain provisions to permit by-elections in larger municipalities, it should require them, and either in this bill or in the amendment to the Municipal Act, there should also be a step taken so that over the next two or three years—I admit it may be too sudden to take place at the coming election—every major municipality in the province, all of the 80 or 90 municipalities in the province with a population of over 10,000 or 15,000 should be divided into wards, wards which are of relatively equal size, wards which are of relatively homogeneous composition, and not the bastardized strict wards that, for example, the city of Toronto sought to push through and was refused by the Ontario Municipal Board.

I would hope for some assurance from the minister or from the parliamentary secretary, when we get to that point, that other legislation will be on the way to make by-elections mandatory, and if that is the case, then we would await that legislation. Otherwise, we would want to move amendments on this particular matter during the committee stage of this particular bill.

The next point I want to deal with is the question of campaign expenses.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The matter of campaign expenses would be a separate principle. It is not included in this bill and therefore any discussion on that would be out of order.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is. I can give you the relevant section.

Mr. Speaker: Pardon me. Order, please. I am talking about the candidates' expenses. Is this what you are talking about?

Mr. Cassidy: Well—

Mr. Speaker: That would be a separate principle completely, and it does not form part of this bill.

Mr. Cassidy: Just a minute now, it states in section 8(1) that "except where otherwise specifically provided by this or any other special or general Act, the cost of an election shall be borne by the municipality in which it is held." And there are a number of other features that relate to the cost of election—

Mr. Speaker: If I may get a word in—order, please—this is the cost of the election to the municipality of the various officers necessary to conduct the election, ballot boxes, printing of ballots, the clerk, etc. It has nothing to do with the expenses of candidates, which would be a separate principle completely, and therefore any discussion of that would be out of order.

Mr. Cassidy: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As you have just stated, it is the conduct of the election which is, in fact, a very fundamental part of

the principle of this bill, and that is what I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker: I have made a ruling. It is not debatable. You may question it, but it is not debatable. Any question of candidates' election expenses would be out of order.

Mr. Cassidy: In that case, Mr. Speaker, we will do that in another way, although I might say, with oblique reference to the issue that you have just barred from discussion, that any discussion of that unmentionable subject might well include the possibility of a principle that there should be certain contributions to the costs of candidates by a municipality as a means of making candidacy a more democratic thing and removing—

Mr. Speaker: That would be a separate principle. The ruling holds.

Mr. Cassidy: I am sorry, this is related to the costs borne by the municipalities, Mr. Speaker. However, I sense a certain lack of sympathy there and I will go on to the next point.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): It's about time.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the next point I wanted to talk about was the date when the elections should take place. The select committee considered a number of alternative dates and it suggested that municipal councils should continue to take office on the first day of January and that the election day should continue to be the first Monday in December.

We on this side of the House would ask the government why the first day of January? Why a Monday? Why the first Monday in December? In fact, we believe that as a means of making the municipal election more accessible and as a means of encouraging more people to vote in municipal elections there is a very urgent and very important need for change in the date of the election from the first Monday in December which, as I am sure the Speaker has noted, is within the principle of the bill. Okay.

The first point is, why the first day of January? I am convinced that January has so many Ontario residents so depressed that municipal councils lose at least a month in taking office, between the duties of getting organized and the problems of getting over their Christmas hangovers. It seems to me that in fact there should be no particular need to adhere to the first day of January as the first day for a council to take office.

In many respects it would make more sense for the council to begin to take office a month earlier—that would be, let's say, the first day of December—in order to have some lead time on the forthcoming fiscal year of the municipality in order that the new council would be genuinely able, as it cannot now, to influence the budget for the forthcoming year. There are no particular problems or hangups that are created by this kind of a change.

We suggest that to move the election forward by a month to early November would do a number of things. In the first place, in terms of participation, it would make campaigning by candidates and by people working on their behalf tremendously easier than it is right now. The month of November is miserable, wet and cold as any football fan will tell you. The month of October is sunny and brilliant and glorious and, in fact, is almost ideal weather for campaigning. I think that is fairly important.

As an extension of that or as a justification for that, I know that the member for York East is aware of the miserable turnouts that exist in municipal elections in city after city, municipality after municipality in this province. This is why the bill itself is important and this is why a change of date is important. Any step that we can take in this Legislature in order to try to involve more citizens in municipal politics will be to the good. It might be said that purely to vote in a municipal election isn't an awful lot of participation, but I would suggest to the parliamentary secretary and to the hon. Speaker that it is at least the first step.

Once having voted, people watch to see how their candidate goes. The next time around they take the steps beyond the mere act of putting a ballot in the box in order to become genuinely involved and to be participating on a monthly or a daily basis and not just once every two years. This, of course, is another reason for supporting the biennial election. Until people turn out, there is no point in turning them off by never bringing the council back for their approbation.

We would suggest that this province follow the example of the Province of Quebec and of many European countries in moving the polling date from Monday until Sunday. This is why we come eventually to the question—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Sunday elections? Never!

An hon. member: No way.

Mr. Cassidy: If you can have sports on Sunday and if you can have movies on Sunday, why can't an essential democratic function be carried out on a Sunday?

An hon. member: There are six other days of the week.

Mr. Cassidy: If the Catholic population of the Province of Quebec sees no problem—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Haggerty: Why not Saturdays?

Mr. Cassidy: Don't you guys realize that most people don't go to church and that the people who go to church should not in fact dictate—

Mr. Haggerty: Sure they do.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Cassidy: —where there are other essential and good reasons. It is quite obvious that the election need not be held in the morning. In fact, in order to—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Do you agree with that?

Mr. Cassidy: —avoid conflict with the Lord's Day Act the polls would probably have to open perhaps at noon and be held open until 9 in the evening, rather than opening at 8 o'clock in the morning. The members laugh.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): It's a lot more important than—

Mr. Cassidy: I can tell you that within five or six years you may well find that provincial elections are held on a Sunday for the very same reason that—

Mr. G. Nixon: Why not Saturday? What's the difference?

Mr. Cassidy: The important thing about Sunday is that that is the day when the largest proportion of the population is free from work and, therefore, have the time—

Mr. Lewis: They can vote—

Mr. Cassidy: —to get involved, to vote, possibly to work on behalf of you or him or some other municipal candidate. They have that freedom and, if they don't vote then, there can be absolutely no excuse for their failure to exercise their franchise. There is no defence for them when they come back and say those guys at city hall are running things, because they had a chance to vote.

This Legislature leaned over backward and ensured that chance to vote was available to almost everybody in the society. I am very surprised at the hon. members who, I am sure, support Sunday football, Sunday movies and other Sunday sports then turning around and saying you can't have an election on a Sunday.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, it is just absurd and hypocritical. You can entertain on a Sunday but you can't have a vote.

Mr. Renwick: You can go to Ontario Place on a Sunday, but you can't vote.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): You do not have to play football, do you, but you do have to vote.

Mr. Cassidy: Anybody who had religious objections, including the entire Liberal caucus, Mr. Speaker, would be free to go and vote at the advance poll the previous day.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Oh, come on.

Mr. Cassidy: I just see nothing more absurd than the kind of attitude coming from that side of the House. I really am surprised. I would suggest to the parliamentary secretary—

Mr. G. Nixon: Boy, are you ever off base!

Mr. Lewis: We finally triggered some of the old impulses.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: —that the objections of the Liberal Party perhaps are one of the very good reasons for adopting a progressive measure and for going ahead with the Sunday vote. I am very pleased to notice the objections to this proposal have come mainly from that side of the House and that the hon. secretary and his fellow members have listened with interest rather than—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, let it be noted in Hansard that "that side" is the Liberal side, in case there is any confusion. There are a few Tories who are excitable.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, we feel, and I feel personally, that there are some very grave dangers and problems in municipal government. I tried to enunciate them when

I talked in the Throne Speech debate—and including that side of the House—they are a very real threat too. Anything that we in this Legislature can do, and certainly such a constructive step as this one, to bring the election forward to a time when campaigning is easier, to put the election on a Sunday, when it is accessible to the vast bulk of the population, would be very useful. The consequential move of the enumeration, which would have to be compressed a bit, and the bringing of municipal councils into office on Dec. 1, before their Christmas hangovers rather than after, and letting the terms run out at the end of November, two years following, would be very easily done.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He ought to go to church a little more.

Mr. Cassidy: I can tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition that, as a former lay preacher, in fact, I am very happy to propose this kind of step. I find—

Interjections by hon. member.

Mr. Cassidy: —that it creates absolutely no religious problem in the least.

Mr. W. Newman: Whom did you preach to?

An hon. member: In the back country where you have never been.

Mr. Cassidy: I would suggest that, given the—

Mr. Renwick: The man will preach on Sunday morning and vote on Sunday afternoon.

Mr. Cassidy: —very honourable history, in fact, of members of the Christian church in supporting and in fighting for democratic systems, it is a travesty of the Christian religion for members of that caucus on that side over there to raise the kind of objections they do. There are people who have been priests and ministers and who have been prominent laymen in the churches who have fought for democracy and who would endorse this proposal 100 per cent and not raise the hypocritical, backward, antediluvian, small-town Ontario kind of objections that we have just heard.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue. The hon. member will have his turn to speak at some future time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the member guarantee that?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, there is another point which I think also should be covered in this bill. I can't find the relevant section, but I think the government, particularly after the little charade we have had in Ottawa recently with Mr. Dick at the provincial level, should and ought to write into this bill, provisions that allow municipal civil servants to become candidates at municipal elections in the way that they cannot right now. And that also needs elucidation, and is not elucidated in this particular bill.

We shall have a number of things to say later on. I would just like to bring to the minister's attention or to the attention of the member for York East, something which in our view reflects the problem that the government had with this bill. They started out with the report, which wasn't bad. Maybe it was essentially an Ontarian report, and didn't go as far as it should and preserved perhaps a bit too much of the past.

Then the government backed down on it. It backed down on a report of this very Legislature in which members of all three parties were involved. And in some of the fundamental principles they wouldn't go on. And then they have the effrontery, not only to bring in an undemocratic franchise and do a number of other things over which we have very grave objection, but then on page 25 of the bill they admitted—really, how brazenly, it just amazes me—where it says, Mr. Speaker, before section 47, where and how often electors may vote. We say they vote once. And we think the government should take that attitude.

Mr. Lewis: Notice that the government itself applauds?

An hon. member: He is finished.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London North.

Mr G. W. Walker (London North): Mr Speaker, I rise certainly in support of the bill, but more particularly to express my—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! It has been suggested that there is a list. I must inform the hon. members there is no list. The hon. member for London North.

Mr Walker: I think they are referring to a list.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in particular support of section 10, relative to the biennial elections.

And I can only indicate that it is my opinion that it is a good thing to happen. I suppose the real issue is whether or not we have a one-year term, a two-year term, or a three- or four-year term. It really comes down to your own personal feeling. I think all of us would assume that a one-year term would be really too little, just not enough, and totally inappropriate. With respect to a four-year; well I think my remarks with respect to three years will rule out the possibility of a four-year term in my own mind.

But I would like to draw some reference to my own city of London where there have been some problems with the city council and their choice of a three-year term. In 1966 the city council of the day very magnanimously decided that their next term should be three years. They didn't have the support of the public in the choice of this, and the next election saw a council of 19 elected and before the end of three years there was a change of six members on that—over 30 per cent of that council were not elected to the positions that they then held. There were deaths and vacancies and so on created. In short, three years had become far too long a period.

The board of education, which was saddled with the albatross of a three-year period, found itself making replacements for replacements. It became absolutely ridiculous.

Ultimately the ridiculousness was very obvious, and it came to a question of a motion and council approved—I believe it was my motion in this case—a two-year term. And then there was a referendum held.

Now I think referendums in London are particularly noteworthy because that city is an average city. It is a test city. If urban thought is to be sought, London is the place to go. If you want to sell soap, that is where you sell it. You can go and have your test market—

Mr. Bullbrook: They have shifted some of it out of town.

Mr. Walker: You go and you have your test market in London. We don't have any bologna down there but lots of soap. In any case, Mr. Speaker, a referendum was held to determine whether the people approved a two-year term or a three-year term. And may I say that the results of that referendum were two to one. The results were something like 27,000 supporting a two-year term, and 13,000 against a two-year term.

Mr. Cassidy: The people were right.

Mr. Walker: Well, in view of the fact this reflects urban thought, those of you from Toronto can pretty well detect exactly the feelings of the urban community in that regard. The other aspect with respect to a two-year term, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to a three-year term is that, if given a choice of three years, many qualified people refuse to run because the period is far too long. Many of them just don't want to commit themselves for three years; they will settle for two years, but they are not going to take some of that guff for three years and I think that is a very strong point, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: They've got four years more to go.

Mr. Walker: Well, the guff they take here isn't nearly as bad as what you take, with respect to a sewer, down in London.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I think the remark made by the hon. member for Ottawa Centre is quite accurate that really only the politicians are the ones who want the extended terms and I suppose their motives might be somewhat questionable taking account of all the circumstances at hand. The people, when they have a chance to speak, want a two-year term, and I think you've seen that, Mr. Speaker, in the riding of London North, certainly in the entire city of London, two years is the favoured amount, and when the people finally rise up and say what they want, they are usually right.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To begin with I think we should note the Act respecting municipal elections does its greatest service, I think, in extending the franchise to people who were previously deprived of it. I speak of the fact that previously, under the Municipal Franchise Extension Act, there were many people within the province denied their rights to vote simply because the local municipality didn't want to give it to them and that is the major merit of this bill, I think.

In my own riding we have had numerous examples. I cited as an example previously that we have a large group of people housed in a trailer park who, even if they did have the Municipal Franchise Extension Act extended to them, would still not be able to vote for members of school board under existing situations. That was the case in

spite of the fact that they paid $120 a year toward school support and $120 a year towards general municipal support.

I say that the condition was very alarming and should have been corrected a long time ago. People who were disenfranchised still paid taxes to a degree which is perhaps greater than many tenants are paying tax generated in a three- or four-room apartment within the city.

I applaud that part of the bill in that that disenfranchisement will be corrected, especially as it relates to people who should have had the vote both for municipal council and for school board.

I feel the definition regarding residency in the first section of the bill, the principle involved here, is taken directly from the Election Act which governs provincial elections. While it may not create any problems in some areas of the province, I do maintain that in cities such as Waterloo and Kingston where you have a large university population coupled with a small municipal population, or relatively small municipal population, the definition of residency of the voter is very, very important, not so much as to whether they vote in this locality or in that locality but we found in the last provincial election that the students at the universities themselves could not interpret the Act with any degree of accuracy as to whether they should be voting at their university residence or back home at their parental residence.

The explanation given by the Clerk of the Legislature was of some help and this was relayed to most of the students. However, when the students read the headline of the Toronto paper stating that many students may be voting illegally they were quite concerned, of course. I think, Mr. Speaker, until we get a better defined residency rule, as to where students at university should vote, this problem will always remain.

In my own city there will be about 9,000 university voters and perhaps 16,000 or 17,000 municipal voters; I feel a very large percentage of the municipal voting will be done by the people at the university, both the students and faculty, if they care to vote. And perhaps in only the two municipalities that I have mentioned could this be any cause of concern. Last fall, we had three candidates from the university seeking municipal election. I think this is a very healthy situation, but some municipal people now fear what would happen if we had 50 candidates from the university seeking election on municipal council. In fact, they do represent an unproportionately large number of the municipal voters, and while I don't expect any problems—

Mr. Cassidy: What are you afraid of, democracy?

Mr. Good: I'm not afraid of anything, I'm just saying the confusion arises in the minds of these people as to where they should be legally voting. The definition of residents as spelled out here and in the Election Act is ambiguous, in my mind and in their minds. So perhaps they don't know where they should vote. It finally ends up with them simply telling the enumerator they want to vote here or they want to vote at home. That is accepted; there has never been any challenge, to my knowledge, as to where the students should vote.

Mr. Cassidy: You smell the revolution every time you see a student.

Mr. Good: As for the other matters I'd like to deal with, first of all I think the idea of a province-wide day of voting is an excellent idea. I do not think there has been the proper amount of enthusiasm generated in our municipal elections, both for councils and for school boards, and I think that having a province-wide day of voting should generate a certain amount of additional enthusiasm all across the province. There will be much municipal talk, and we won't have the problems of one municipality voting one year, another municipality another year and sort of a piecemeal bit of interest. I think it is a commendable idea to hold them on the first Monday in December; I have no quarrel with that. I think it gives ample time for the new council to take office at the beginning of the year.

Regarding the money bylaw clause, I'm just wondering about its value. Actually we don't have any money bylaw votes any more, or very seldom, because of the provisions whereby municipalities can get Municipal Board approval of a money expenditure without going to the people. But that is continued, and under that section the vote is denied all others than property owners.

Section 12, Mr. Speaker, still retains, in my view, the archaic principle where the vote is given to Canadian citizens or British subjects. In this day and age I can't see what is so magic about being a British subject in the Province of Ontario, which should give him a municipal franchise over and above the subject of any other country. I think that to be realistic about it, we should say that

Canadian citizen should be the definition and the British subject aspect could very well be dropped. I think this would be concurred in by a great many people across the province.

I'd like to go into the matter of enumeration in some detail, but I will do that later on in my remarks.

The multiple voting principle, I think, should be discussed a little more thoroughly. I personally cannot see—

Mr. Cassidy: That's a forthright stand for the Liberal Party.

Mr. Good: I cannot see that there is that much value in giving the franchise to a person because he happens to own some property in another municipality. If a person is a landlord in another municipality, his tenants will do the voting for that piece of property in the other municipality. However, I do see value in allowing the franchise to be extended to a person who, part of the year, has residency in another municipality. And, of course, that would include cottage owners.

So I think the franchise should be extended, in the case of cottage owners, where they do live and have a social, economic and a municipal interest in that municipality for part of the year. This part varies anywhere from two to four months, and I'm sure some cottage owners wives live in the municipality even longer than that. I think the franchise should be extended in the case of cottage owners, but I can't see any need for allowing the vote to be given to people just because they own an acre of land, a sixplex or something else in every municipality or every ward around a municipality. Therefore, I would ask the parliamentary assistant to give some consideration to that thought.

Regarding the matter of the by-election procedure, in municipalities of considerable size—and I speak of my neighbouring municipality of Kitchener, a city of well over 105,000 or 110,000 people—there are no wards used for the election of aldermen. I would think it quite a costly procedure to require a by-election, which could happen according to this Act, if an aldermanic post became vacant seven months before a municipal election was scheduled.

I don't think it is practical to put a municipality to the expense of having a general election to elect one alderman seven months before a municipal election in a city of the size of, say, St. Catharines, Kitchener, Guelph or some of our larger municipalities—even down to, say, the size of 25,000 or 35,000.

If there was a stipulation that these cities had to get on a ward system—and I think there is perhaps some merit in being on a ward system once a city reaches a certain size—then I could say that a by-election would be quite in order if we had a smaller ward system and did not require a general election throughout the whole breadth of a municipality.

Referring to the sections dealing with the enumeration process, my understanding is that the assessment department in each area will do an enumeration in that municipality right after Labour Day. This must be completed by the second Tuesday in October. It is also my information that from now on the assessment department will be interested only in matters pertaining to assessment. Enumeration for voting purposes, the establishment of school support and all matters such as that, will be done by the provincial assessment office but then will be placed in the hands of the municipal clerk.

The local assessment office will no longer determine school support, and I understand the assessment roll will contain only property values and school support now will be listed on the voters' list. So instead of an assessment notice stating a voter's school support, which is very vital to both public and separate school boards, the enumerator will just leave, at the taxpayer's residence, an enumeration slip which will show the detail as specified in section 18.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that section 18 does not include the address. I would hope that surely the address of each person will be included on the enumeration list, which will be a permanent document kept by the city clerk from one year to the next that he will have to use for a great variety of purposes.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in my view this bill is transferring back to the municipalities many of the functions which were originally done by assessment departments. The province has taken over assessment in Ontario, and now it is turning back many of the costly and provocative functions to the municipality. This is my interpretation of this whole section of the bill, and I don't think that is too far out.

The municipal clerk, according to this bill, will have complete custody of school support and other statistical information, and he will have to take the responsibility for

the correction of this list right up until voting day.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the parliamentary assistant to tell me whether or not this list is going to be revised just every two years; whether an enumeration will be taken by the assessment department just every two years and placed in the hands of the municipality, or whether the assessment department is going to take an enumeration annually?

According to my interpretation, the principle in section 21 is that the list of electors prepared under sections 18, 19 and 20 by the regional assessment office, will be turned over to the clerk on or before the second Tuesday of October in an election year. If the municipal clerk must keep that enumeration and voters list up to date, he cannot possibly do it by getting an enumeration from the assessment office just every two years. The province is throwing back on to the municipality thousands and thousands of dollars worth of extra work which, with such great fanfare, they said a few years ago they were taking away from the municipality and would do. And we all know what poor service many municipalities have had from the regional assessment office in getting some of the information which they had in their own department in the assessment office when the assessment was under the municipal responsibility.

Mr. Ruston: Terrible, terrible.

Mr. Haggerty: Terrible is right.

Mr. Good: So, we now find that the clerk is keeper of the enumeration list, that he is the chief reviewer of that list, and it will be his responsibility to establish school support on that list. I would ask the parliamentary assistant to indicate to me whether or not this is correct, and whether or not the separate school board and the other school boards, the general school boards, will have to refer to the municipal clerk to ascertain their school support. This is a very important matter as far as the school boards are concerned, but according to the principle of this bill, it appears that that is where the whole matter of school support will lie. If the municipal clerk has the school support information, I understand that presently, under the Separate Schools Act, section 51, a school support index book should be kept by each municipal clerk. In my understanding, there are very very few of these books being kept by municipal clerks across the province. If the school boards are going to have to rely on this school support index book, I would suggest that there are going to have to be some changes in the Separate Schools Act, as well as the Assessment Act, to make it mandatory and compulsory that municipal clerks do keep these school index books, so that the county school boards and the separate school boards can have an accurate way of finding out school support.

I also gather from this Act, Mr. Speaker, that the assessment review court will no longer be available to ascertain or to argue the merits of school support between public and separate school support. In that case, I would wonder where one goes beyond the local municipality to appeal a school support, or whether you just walk in and change it in the school support index book.

These are questions which are bothering the school boards in relation to the Municipal Elections Act, and that was why I felt that changes in the Schools Administration Act as well as the Assessment Act should have been in our hands before we discussed this bill.

I am also told, Mr. Speaker—and I don't know if this is correct; I would ask for a response—that it is impossible for children over 18 years of a separate school supporter to vote for separate school board trustees. I understand there is no provision that that can be done.

Also, I feel we are going to have to establish under some Act—if it isn't in here, or if it is not implied in here—an enquiry method regarding the separate school index book, which will have to be kept by the clerk and he will have to be responsible for its revisions.

I am wondering about these lease arrangements regarding mixed marriages. That is where you have children going to a separate school and the husband is not a separate school supporter; he has to arrange a lease arrangement with his wife. Now, since the clerk is the final school support reviser, I am asking what appeal is there to the clerk's decision?

It seems to me that all the contentious issues are being turned back to the municipal clerk. They were taken away from the municipal assessment department, and supposedly are going to be done by the province. Now we see the costly parts of keeping the role up to date and in dealing with all the inquiries that come in regarding school support and other matters such as real estate agents. These are all now being turned back again

to the municipality. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear a complete analysis of how this is going to work as it relates to the enumeration list which is designated in this Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): I would like to participate just briefly with respect to one aspect of this bill which was touched on by the member for Waterloo North; and that is the provision of full voting rights now under this bill for residents of mobile homes.

Previously, or at present until this bill is passed, anyone in that category could only vote for municipal councillors, and then only if the municipality passed a bylaw permitting it. This was a serious denial of the rights of these people, many of whom are long-term residents; far longer-term residents than the average apartment dweller. They have children attending school. They have a community interest that I would say is comparable to any in municipalities.

Incidentally, some members will recall; I think those members are here who spoke to the private bill which I introduced last year advocating an extension to the Franchise Extension Act to make this provision. So if it gave this bill a little heave along the way, I think all those who participated will have some gratification and certainly this class of resident will be pleased.

If I recall correctly, at that time some research and some statistics were provided to me by the Mobile Home Owners Association. There were some 16,000 mobile homes in the province in a certain number of parks and in some individual locations; and they housed some 32,000 people. This was the number of people in this province in the year of our Lord, 1971-1972, who were denied the right to participate in the education of their children and in participation with Hydro and public utility commissions, such as the water commission.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How many?

Mr. Kennedy: About 32,000; taking two persons per 16,000 units. That was fairly easy mathematics to compute; I didn't even need the new math to do it.

So I am happy to commend the department, the minister and the parliamentary secretary, in bringing this forward. It is a great step ahead and I know it will be appreciated by those citizens. This very comprehensive bill has many good clauses—in fact, they are all good. I could tell this from the previous speakers who supported it with great enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): It is Sudbury, Mr. Speaker, and I have just a few comments on this bill. Generally I am in favour of this bill. I had certain experience at the municipal level as an alderman and as a controller and there has been quite a bit said about the residency requirements of the electors, but nothing has been said about our representatives and their residency requirements.

During one of my terms on the council in the city of Sudbury, it came about that, because there were no requirements under the Election Act that a person had to live in a ward in order to represent the ward, out of 17 members on the council, nine of them happened to come from one ward. And I am sure you can guess which ward that was from. That was from the ward where all the lawyers, and the doctors, and all the business types live in the city of Sudbury. This ward, with having nine votes out of 17, of course got very good treatment that year.

So there has to be some protection for those wards which are normally working class and which just cannot mount a campaign to offset the affluence and the power that the business community, and the legal profession, and the doctors and all the other types have. So there is a whole multitude of people who are not represented at the council level. And no way do these people who live in this particular area know the problems of these other working class areas of the city. I note that this thing has not been corrected in this Bill 77. I just wondered if the minister thought about this, or was it ever brought to anyone's attention that this discrepancy does exist?

I think if some thought were given—if you analyse the composition of the councils and find out how unrepresentative they are of the population generally, you may come to some conclusions as to why the participation by the voters is so low. You know it is quite difficult to even get 50 per cent of the population out to vote at the municipal level, and I think it is because councils have become irrelevant to most of the people in most of our communities just because of this imbalance of power at this local level.

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): Mr. Speaker, rightfully or wrongfully our municipal taxation is based on, for the most part, real property assessment, with the result that a good proportion of the taxes that municipalities raise are raised on the value of real estate. There is also an old maxim that there should be no taxation without representation. I think that is a very important maxim to maintain. And thankfully the bill that is before the House does do just that.

Mr. Cassidy: The Conservative wing is beginning to speak.

Mr. MacBeth: If I may use a personal reference, I don't live in the city of Toronto but I have a business in the city of Toronto and I pay considerable business tax to the coffers of the city of Toronto. I also take a very active interest in the welfare of the city of Toronto and am very pleased that by reason of the business tax I pay there that I do have a vote in the city of Toronto which I exercise.

Mr. Cassidy: It is your clients that pay that tax through you.

Mr. MacBeth: Now, I am very pleased to exercise that vote; and I hope I exercise it wisely and in the best interests of the city of Toronto.

Mr. Lewis: Tell us who you vote for.

Mr. MacBeth: I think it would be very unreasonable, Mr. Speaker, if I was asked to pay a good portion of the city of Toronto's taxes without having any voice or any word in what the city of Toronto used my money for. So I don't think it is any new or wrong principle. I think it is maintaining a just and an old principle.

An hon. member: Why shouldn't General Motors have a vote as well?

Mr. MacBeth: I think General Motors should have a vote, Mr. Chairman. Maybe one or two votes to represent the big assessment that they carry in the city of Oshawa. Maybe they should have more than one vote when you consider the taxes they pay.

Mr. Cassidy: They should have a vote at the municipal level too.

Mr. MacBeth: Each person who works for General Motors does have a vote in the provincial elections.

Mr. Lawlor: And each person who works for your firm has too.

Mr. MacBeth: Not necessarily in the city of Toronto where the taxes are paid.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I am surprised that an original thinking man should be saying that General Motors can have votes equivalent to the entire quota of their employees.

Mr. MacBeth: Maybe they should.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe General Motors should have votes according to the number of employees.

Mr. Cassidy: Look at the tax they pay.

Mr. MacBeth: However in regard to money bylaws, I was talking about the taxation being tied in with assessment. Now money bylaws, as the member for Waterloo North said, don't come before the electorate very often. But when they do they are generally over a fairly controversial issue. And it could be that where we have a transient population, again such as the member for Waterloo North mentioned, of say university students, who might be there for a year or two, and have the vote—

Mr. Cassidy: The member obviously distrusts the democratic process.

Mr. MacBeth: They could saddle the council and the realty of that municipality with something that those who were remaining for 20 years, over which the money might be debentured, would have to pay for.

Mr. Cassidy: Why don't you come into the 20th century?

Mr. Lawlor: You have overt oligarchical tendencies.

Mr. MacBeth: Now it seems, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to have financial responsibility, and some of the members at my immediate right would not know what financial responsibility is—

Mr. Cassidy: The squire of the Tories is speaking.

Mr. MacBeth: But if you are going to have financial responsibility, it is only right and just that money bylaws, where they are controversial and are put to the people, should again be decided by those who are going to have to pay for them over the course of years.

Mr. Cassidy: So the will of the voters can be frustrated.

Mr. MacBeth: Now just one word on the suggestion—

Mr. Lawlor: I thought they abolished the Senate in Ontario.

Mr. MacBeth: —that Sunday should be the voting day. You know, there are some of us who still have regard for the rights of few minorities. There are still a few people in the province of Ontario who believe the Ten Commandments; some of them even practise it, Mr. Speaker. Some of us also believe that voting is a democratic responsibility—not a privilege, but a responsibility. It is not something that you do by choice, it is a duty that you should exercise.

Going to a football game, to the tavern or doing some of these other things—these are not responsibilities, but voting is. And I don't think that we in this Legislature should consider for one moment the thought—

Mr. Lawlor: They dutifully go to the tavern.

Mr. MacBeth: —that we should force people to do a duty which might go against their religious principles.

Mr. Cassidy: You feel we should make it as difficult as possible for people to go to the polls?

Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken.

An hon. member: Well done!

An hon. member: Very good.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to enter the debate? If not, the hon. member for York East.

Mr. Lawlor: You have just cancelled—

Mr. MacBeth: I get a little nervous.

Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, to begin with, may I thank the hon. members opposite for their indication that they propose to support this bill in principle.

This bill provides the mechanics of the conduct of an election or of a by-election. It doesn't tamper with other pieces of legislation. At one stage we contemplated trying to draw into one Act all the factors and Acts, such as the Municipal Act, disqualifications of candidates and the provisions in the various schools Acts as to qualifications of candidates.

But eventually we decided that it just wasn't practical to do it at this time. As it is, our draftsmen have worked many months to put together this very complex piece of legislation. There will be related amendments in quite a number of other bills that will be before this session of the Legislature, which I think will serve to answer most, if not all, for that matter, of the questions asked by members opposite.

I agree with the member for Waterloo North when he says that he thinks that one of the greatest features, if not the greatest feature of this bill, is the extension of the franchise to include not only owners but residents, tenants and so on in the various municipalities. This was a recommendation by the select committee, and by the municipal elections committee as well, that qualified residents as well as owners be entitled to vote.

It used to be, as you know, that it was only the owners who were entitled to vote in the past. As mentioned also by the member for Waterloo North, the Municipal Franchise Extension Act has only been somewhat narrowly adopted and there are many municipalities in which residents never did have the right to vote. Under the new provisions, therefore, every elector gets to vote—gets a vote, may I put it that way—for council, for school board, on any question or bylaw, except for a money bylaw. I will come back to that later.

On the matter of qualifications, Canadian citizen or other British subject—I have noted with interest the comments of the member for Ottawa Centre in this regard. We kept them the same as those under the provincial Election Act. We didn't think it sensible to extend them further at this time.

I think it is fair to say there should be some kind of incentive to landed immigrants arriving here. Four or five years from the time they arrive until they get the opportunity to vote at the municipal level, certainly in areas like Metropolitan Toronto, and indeed it seems to me in every last municipality in Ontario, isn't going to be too long for them to get to know the people, get to know the issues, get to know the nature of the game. I think it is specious to suggest that because they have uprooted themselves from their native homes and come thousands of miles to settle here in Ontario we should automatically afford them a vote. For goodness' sake, we have accorded them a home and it seems to me that's going a long way.

Mr. Renwick: Come! Come!

Mr. Cassidy: Then do it—

Mr. Lewis: Why do it for British subjects then?

An hon. member: Why not?

Mr. Cassidy: Why make distinctions?

Mr. Lewis: The member should go to the cultural congress next month and explain to all the groups why he discriminates in favour of British subjects.

Mr. Meen: I would suggest to the hon. members who would know this, that they might take a look at the reasoning in the report of the select committee in which they adopted this principle. We are simply following along with that same principle. Perhaps if they want to talk and have another select committee on the subject we might come out further. But in any event that's where it stands. I don't—

Mr. Lewis: The member is discriminating against—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Meen: —I don't expect at this stage—

Mr. Renwick: It is exactly—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Meen: —we can justify spending—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member sat very quietly for the last hour and a half. Surely, members can afford him the courtesy of a reply.

Mr. Meen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I have listened courteously from 3:30 until this hour of the afternoon without interjection.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, when he uses a weak argument—

An hon. member: They have no courtesy over there. They don't know what the word means.

Mr. Lewis: We weren't provocative.

Mr. Meen: In any event, were we to remove the provision of the vote to a British subject we would disenfranchise thousands of British subjects here including the wife of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Lewis: We are not asking the government to remove it—we are asking it to include the others!

Mr. Cassidy: We ask you to enlarge, not restrict. The position is untenable.

Mr. Meen: I don't propose to labour this much further, Mr. Speaker. The point is clear. We are following the recommendation of the committee and we are following a consistent position taken at the time of the passage of the Ontario Act.

One of the very important additional features in this bill is the establishment of a common date for all elections in all municipalities across Ontario. I know we are receiving pressure and we are hearing arguments from municipal politicians who would like the continuation of the three-year term. We can't justify that across all of Ontario. We are bringing everyone into line on a two-year basis.

One thing that no one seems to have mentioned so far that is uppermost in my mind is that the power of the press in large metropolitan areas like Toronto is so significant that we would be reluctant to allow elections in one area like Toronto on a three-year basis when the elections in other municipalities were on a two-year basis.

In some years there would be coincidence of the elections, for example, every six years. If every other municipality were on a two-year basis and Toronto and London and some of the other larger centres were on a three-year basis, it would mean that there would be a coincidence of the municipal elections only once every six years. The other two elections in the rest of the province would be without the impact of the interest that is raised by the press in these large urban areas.

It is our desire to increase the interest shown at the municipal level. When you see a turnout provincially—when everyone goes to the polls on the same day—of 75 per cent, 80 per cent and compare that with an average across the province—you look at the various municipal elections of 30, 35 per cent, if you are lucky, you realize that something has to be done to engender some interest. This is really what we are trying to do.

This two-year figure was recommended by all of the committees that studied this. Really we have weighed the pros and cons of excepting large metropolitan areas, such as Toronto, from the two-year term and allowing them to continue on a three-year term. There are certainly disadvantages to the candidates. There are certainly additional costs to be expected by the municipalities themselves in going from three years to two years.

Taking those disadvantages and weighing them in the scales of justice against the advantages to be gained in the democratic process by, hopefully—and this is what we are expecting—allowing the engendering of far more interest across the entire province by having everyone go to the polls on the same day, we find that it is far more desirable to do this even though it is disadvantageous to areas like Toronto. I listened with interest to the member for Ottawa Centre in his expression of support in that regard, inasmuch as he comes from an area that is presently on a three-year term.

Mr. Cassidy: We are rather in a minority down there.

Mr. Meen: The harmonizing of these things is something that all these committees have agreed should be done. We are endeavouring to take a full step at this time.

We recognize that there has to be a period during which a phasing-in will occur. For example, London, I believe, went to the polls last December for the years 1972, 1973 and 1974.

I might mention in that regard—and if there are any other municipalities that had this happen—when this goes to committee, we will provide an amendment to fix up that section. It was intended to do this but it seems to be slightly lacking.

It provides for other terms which would expire other than this year. If they expire this year then, of course, they go to the polls for two years. If their terms expire next year, they will come up for election next year and that will be for a one-year term to expire in the following December when they will then go to the polls for two years like everyone else.

As I say, what we neglected to pick up in the section were the few cases—I know of just one offhand, but there may be others—in which they went to the polls last year for a three-year term. We will fix that up. There is no intention to curtail any municipal term. Likewise, there is no intention to extend any municipal term beyond its basic period.

The matter of the common date also raised the problem of when that date should be. It was recommended by the select committee that it be the first Monday in December. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we have had some submissions from municipalities which would like to see it advanced to an earlier date, as suggested, I believe, by the hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

The difficulty with this is that in going by an assessment—I am sorry, by an enumeration—conducted by the assessment department on a sort of blitz basis, beginning in September, in which they can do the work only in a minimum period of five weeks, following which time, by Oct. 10, they can give each one of the municipal clerks a printout of the pertinent voter information—the electoral information—there are then certain minimum periods of time which we have built into the Act for courts of revision, for appeals and so on.

Beyond that, you get into the terms for nomination. If you add up all these periods of time, plus a time for advance poll, you wind up with the first Monday of December as the first practical time. So, if we do the enumeration, beginning in September, the only way in which we will be able to advance the date of polling, the actual election date, to a date earlier than the first Monday in December, say, for example, the first Monday in November, would be to start the enumeration process one month earlier.

If any of the hon. members here have been involved in trying to find enumerators during the month of August to put on a blitz of this sort, they will appreciate the problem the assessment department would face. They told us they could not undertake this programme and provide the clerks with the pertinent electoral information, unless it was started no earlier than the first Tuesday following Labour Day. That is the reason, as much as anything else, for winding up with the first Monday in December as election day. We have been able to fit it in, but just. If we had to have any longer period of time for any of these factors, we would then not be able to do it. But it has been worked out. We are confident that it will work.

I had considerable discussions and lengthy discussions with representatives of the assessment department when it was then part of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and we were able to work that out. These same gentlemen, as members of the Ministry of Revenue, are co-operating fully with us and, I am sure, they will co-operate fully with the clerks in the provision of the necessary information for them.

In light of the provision that everyone goes to the polls on the same date and, recognizing the principles that a vote attaches to the real estate—and I emphasize that, because that is an answer in itself to the hon. member for Ottawa Centre and to others

who would suggest the one-man-one-vote principle—

Mr. Cassidy: It is no answer at all.

Mr. Lewis: That is some answer; it was good in 1872, but not in 1972.

Mr. Meen: —because we are not adopting that. We are recognizing the view as expressed by the hon. member for York West that if you are paying taxes you have a right to a say and to a vote with respect to the people who are going to spend your tax dollars.

Mr. Cassidy: It is not recognized in corporations.

Mr. Meen: To accomplish this, Mr. Speaker, we have provided for advance polls. The advance polls, as provided in the bill, are on the Saturday immediately preceding the voting day—

Mr. Lawlor: Were you around when the first reform Act went through? That was Peel's bill, I think .

Mr. Meen: —and the Monday, one week previously, the second and the seventh days respectively. It may be, and we've had some very cogent arguments put to us in this regard, that this period is not too satisfactory. When this matter is before committee, we will have some further discussion on it. It looks as if, in so doing, we have unintentionally abridged the period of time, within which the clerks can get the ballots printed and distributed to their DROs, to such an extent that it is virtually impractical. It may be that we shall have to go to the second and third days.

We do want to preserve a couple of days for advanced polls. It may be—this is a matter of principle and so I am mentioning it to you here this afternoon—that we will go to a day, such as the Saturday immediately preceding and then the Friday preceding that, the second and the third days respectively before election day. We are looking at this point very carefully indeed, and there will be more discussion in the committee.

We are dealing with hours of voting. This, again, has caused some problems. We want, wherever possible, to have this Act coincide with the provisions of the provincial Act. Consequently, we set up the time as 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. What I don't think we really thought about sufficiently was, that by the time we get into one of these elections in December, it is standard time, and 8 in the morning is a little bit early for a clerk to arrive and 7 o'clock at night turns out, as the clerks rather articulately expressed to us, a little too soon to close the polls. There are a lot of people who get out of work at 5 or 5:30 and don't get home and, if we close the polls at 7, they may be disenfranchised.

Consequently, again in the committee, it is my intention to raise this matter. We are looking into it considering, that we may provide for a period of time for the poll more like that recommended by the select committee which recommended 10 a.m. until 8 p.m. This then, gives a longer time, following the close of normal business hours, for the electors to get to the polls. It also provides a little more lead time in the morning for the DRO to get the information from the clerk as to the numbers who voted in his or her poll at the advance polls on the preceding weekend.

This got pretty close, when you have an advance poll on Saturday and then require the DRO to open her poll the following morning at 8 o'clock. So here again we will be looking at this when the matter gets into committee.

I want to touch on the matter of by-elections; there seems to be some misunderstanding here. I emphasized that this bill deals with the mechanics of an election. I am authorized to tell the hon. members through you, Mr. Speaker, that there will be an amendment. We are proposing an appropriate amendment to the Municipal Act, which is the proper place to put this, which will authorize, though not require, a municipality, a council, to pass a bylaw to call for a by-election should a vacancy occur leaving more than nine months unexpired, i.e. should the vacancy occur before March 31 in an election year. We are not requiring it. We do not buy the argument advanced by the NDP that this should be a requisite.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Why?

Mr. Meen: We do not believe that a municipality should be forced. It might very well be that they know just the man to fill that role for the rest of that period.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Why don't you reserve that right?

Mr. Meen: You might just listen to your Liberal friends on your right, who suggested through their spokesman that there shouldn't be any provision for by-elections at all.

Mr. Cassidy: They are back in the 19th century too.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Meen: Indeed what we are saying is, we are giving more authority to the municipal councils in so many respects. We are prepared to give them authority here to pass a bylaw to call for a by-election if they in their wisdom decide that that is the way to do it.

Mr. Deans: If they can't find a friend to fill the vacancy.

Mr. Meen: No. There are other ways in which this might happen, Mr. Speaker, as we saw earlier this year with respect to the vacancies that were created by judges, by the findings of the court at Thunder Bay. The court ordered that a by-election be conducted. These sections in the bill—

Mr Deans: Of course, they recognized the principle as being important.

Mr. Meen: —dealing with "new elections" are really dealing with by-elections ordered by a court, for whatever reason, or a by-election ordered by bylaw of a municipality.

Mr. Deans: You are not—

Mr. Cassidy: You are not very convincing, though.

Mr. Deans: Maybe you could win it on merit.

Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, at least we are being consistent. We are giving authority to the municipalities We'll let them decide which way they want to do it. We are not going to tell them which way they are going to do it.

Mr. Deans: I don't care what he is, as long as he wins the election.

Mr. Meen: The hon. member for Waterloo North raised some questions about enumeration. As I mentioned, it is the five weeks following Labour Day. There will be a printout to all municipal clerks of the fall voters list. Addresses will be on the list. Now the section does not so stipulate. That will be still another amendment to be introduced at the committee. I might say in parenthesis, Mr. Speaker, that there are just dozens and dozens of mechanical defects which we have detected since we put the bill together, since it was vetted by legislative counsel, since all of us had a run at it in one way or another, and since the clerks and other people through the municipal liaison committee who have worked so hard with us, have had a chance to go over it too. So that is just another one that will be picked up when we get into committee.

I might also observe that it is my recollection, though, remembering that the assessment department of the Ministry of Revenue is no longer directly associated with me and with my minister, that the five-week blitz will be conducted each year. So this information should be available. This is my recollection. I can't tell the hon. members that this is so. Remember again that we are dealing with the mechanics of an election. So under our Act we cannot require that the assessment be done. I am merely telling them that here again there will be certain provisions made through the Assessment Act, and it is my recollection that it was anticipated that this would be conducted every year.

One of the advantages is that if a by-election should be decided upon in the wisdom of a council, they would then have available an up-to-date voters' list, again; at least it would be more up to date than the previous year's voters' list. We will be able to talk about that in the committee also. I think that that is something that may well be available once this gets on a routine annual basis.

There has been a lot of talk about money bylaws. The Municipal Act presently limits voting to landowners as we all know and we have retained this. We have retained it because of the concern expressed by some people as to what might happen with transient voters; and here I was interested in the comments by the member for Waterloo North with respect to the high percentage of university students. I am not suggesting that they are irresponsible, but this is one of the things that has worried us in areas where there may be a high number of transient voters, that they might not pay sufficient attention to money bylaws since they might very well not be around to have to pay off them later on. I thought the point was very well expressed by the hon. member for York West, too. It is a small matter, mind you, inasmuch as the Municipal Act has the authority—

Mr. Cassidy: You distrust the judgement of the electorate, that is what it means.

Mr. Meen: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, the Municipal Board has the authority to dispense with the requisite vote on application and, I am told, by and large they do dispense with the vote. So, it's almost a unique case now when one has a vote on a money bylaw.

I don't think there was much said this afternoon about nominations, but the procedure we are following is again one recommended by the select committee, and actually I think that it's a good one. You don't have to have a nomination day if you don't want one, but you may; you can have the little speeches if you wish to revert to the old time-honoured practice.

We haven't mentioned the form of ballot, but here we are trying to coincide as closely as possible with the provisions of the Ontario Election Act. Of course, you get into different problems where you have multiple-choice voting; you may be voting to elect two aldermen in a ward or you may be voting to elect two Hydro commissioners across the entire municipality. In any event, you have multiple ballots, and we are providing for different coloured paper, different coloured ink. The major features are the same, though, a sort of reverse printing, such as black ink on white paper and we are also providing for the occupation of the candidate to be shown as well.

Proxy voting was mentioned, but I can't get excited about that; we had it last fall and it is worth a try, I think. This, again, was a recommendation of the select committee and I think some of the objections made have come from members who didn't have the opportunity to participate in that select committee and its deliberations. In any event, this certainly is new for municipal voters and we are prepared to give it a try; the committee thinks it should work and we think it should, too.

Some clerks have expressed concern about the effect of irregularities and we have a provision in here which will take care of those because we are concerned, too, that in some areas the clerks may not follow our new Act as closely as might otherwise be required. We have provided in the bill that should some variation on the theme be committed by a clerk as, for example, in the form of ballot, that unless it can be shown a different result would have occurred at the polls, the election is not thereby invalidated.

Touching for a moment on a few of the points made by the hon. members, I have got pages and pages of them and I won't try to go into them in detail, Mr. Speaker, but one point I didn't really get to is this philosophy of multiple voting. Maybe I did in a little way, in a small way touch on it. But we recognize that a vote flows in any municipality, or sector of a municipality designated, as say, a ward, by virtue of that person owning real estate and paying taxes. Either he pays the taxes directly or he pays them through rental.

And so, we feel that not only should a cottage owner have it, if he is resident in Toronto, but has a cottage at Bala. He should not only have a vote here where he lives, but he should also have a vote in Bala, in the township of Medora and Wood, so that he is able to express some support or otherwise for the people who are going to represent him.

And if he happens also to own property distributed throughout all the wards of the municipality in which he lives, indeed, why should he not have an opportunity to vote for the aldermen who are seeking to represent him in those various wards?

Mr. Cassidy: It is absolutely indefensible and the committee said so.

Mr. Meen: No, this is a completely defensible position. It's recognized—

Mr. Cassidy: How one person can vote nine times in the same city?

Mr. Meen: Yes, it recognizes the fact that he is paying nine sets of taxes too.

Mr. Cassidy: His tenants pay those taxes. This is the point.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Meen: This is precisely the point. If he happens, Mr. Speaker, to have all his parcels of property on which he pays taxes within the one ward, then he would get only one vote. Because he has an opportunity—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Meen: —to vote for only one alderman or two as the case may be. He doesn't get the number of votes represented by the number of parcels of taxable real estate. He has one vote attached to all the parcels of real estate in any particular ward. That's the philosophy we are following. And that's the philosophy we propose to follow in this bill.

Mr. Cassidy: You would flunk Philosophy 101 on that one.

Mr. Lawlor: Homerston would put an end to that.

Mr. Cassidy: It's the rotten borough system.

Mr. Meen: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre has mentioned campaign expenses. But quite obviously they are not a part of this bill.

I'm talking about the two-year term again for a moment. He referred to this and as I said at the beginning I am pleased to hear him support our position. I am constrained to think of the quote I read in the paper the other day by Ald. William Archer, who I think can speak with feeling on this subject. Ald. Archer, I am told, said that three years is fine if you are in office but it is a heck of a long time if you are out of office. Knowing Ald. Archer's political history, I can sympathize with his view. I am sure he feels it rather keenly.

Really this is another one of the arguments behind going to a two-year term.

Well, I think I have covered the various points made by the hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker. In general, and in closing, may I say that this bill goes a long way, a very long way indeed, toward implementing the recommendations of the select committee and the municipal elections committee. We did indeed encounter immense complications in endeavouring to have this bill applicable to all elections and for so many types of office, including the problems raised by the hon. member for Waterloo North with respect to the separate school boards.

There will be amendments to those bills too to take care of these various problems. There will have to be some decisions made yet as to the way in which and the extent to which responsibility will be imposed on the municipal clerks. These haven't yet been completely resolved. But they are not properly a part of this bill. They properly fall within the Municipal Act.

And when I bring forward the amendments to the Municipal Act—hopefully later this month and certainly before we rise at the end of this session—we will have included in that Act, and/or by amendments to the other Acts as well, the necessary provisions to accomplish the ends and to straighten out the problems raised by the hon. member for Waterloo North. We recognize them. They are very serious problems. They are mind-boggling in the extent of their permutations. We are hopeful that they can be resolved, and that we will be able to see them all when the various pieces of legislation are laid out before us.

The other day the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs was asked if we would have before us for examination the other counterpart legislation —at the time when we debate this Municipal Elections bill on second reading. I recall his nodding his head, but my indicating that I didn't expect that to be the case.

The hon. minister actually was not aware of the extent to which many of these other sections have to be amended. I was aware that we just could not have them all here in the House in time for this debate on second reading. However, they will be in, hopefully very soon. And we shall be able to see them and to read them all in proper context.

I am going to ask, on the conclusion of this debate, that the bill be referred to the standing committee on administration of justice, so that we can have a full and complete debate on all of these sections. Perhaps we will get it to that committee next week. But whenever we get it there, it will be soon.

In the meantime, we have had, and we will continue to have, quite a number of meetings with the municipalities, with their representatives and with the municipal liaison committee which has given us an enormous amount of assistance in the past. We have had hundreds and hundreds of constructive suggestions and out of these have come quite a large number of amendments which I will be proposing to the committee at that later time.

Also then, of course, we will welcome any of the interested parties—the clerks, and perhaps, who knows, some municipal politicians might also care to come before the committee. We will welcome them and share their views.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is sound. To repeat my opening comment, I am grateful to the opposition parties for their indication of support of this bill in principle. It goes a long way, and we will look forward to intensive study of the sections in the committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the hon. member for York East wants the bill to go to the standing committee.

Mr. Meen: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed, standing committee.

An hon. member: It now being 6 of the clock—

Mr. Speaker: It looks pretty close to me.

It being 6 of the clock I do now leave the chair and we shall resume at eight.

Clerk of the House: There is one bill.

Mr. Speaker: Well, in the absence of the House leader, how can we proceed?

Clerk of the House: We have an order to call.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 117, An Act to amend the Children's Institutions Act.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I understand that 6 of the clock had been called, and we were adjourning for supper?

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker has jurisdiction of the House, and it was pointed out that something had been intended to be called. I therefore retract my observation that it was 6 of the clock. The bill has been introduced.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Speaker. Do you want to launch into a debate now?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I was just going to give a short explanation of that bill.

Mr. Renwick: That would be most helpful.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There are two main purposes, Mr. Speaker, to this bill. The first is to permit operating subsidies to be paid on behalf of persons older than 18 years of age. As a result of the amendment to the Children's Institutions Act by the Age of Majority and Accountability Act which was passed in July, 1971, operating subsidies which formerly could be paid on behalf of children up to age 21, can no longer be paid on behalf of any child older than 18 years of age.

By this amendment, operating subsidies can once again be paid for persons between the ages of 18 and 21. In addition, this amendment would permit payment in respect of certain classes of persons who are older than 21 years of age. It is proposed to transfer certain institutions under the Charitable Institutions Act to this Act. Some of these institutions, for example, homes for unmarried mothers, have residents older than 21 years of age.

The second purpose, Mr. Speaker, is that capital grants payable for institutions under this Act would no longer require an order-in-council, but could be paid upon the authority of the minister of this ministry. This change implements the policy by this department begun when the Day Nurseries Act was amended at the last session of the Legislature. It is intended to make similar changes to the other Acts administered by this department where capital grants are authorized. Financial control by cabinet will be exercised through approval of the departmental estimates by the management board. So briefly, Mr. Speaker, this Act is more or less a—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A housekeeping Act.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: A housekeeping, whereby—

Mr. Lewis: Oh come on. It is hardly that.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —we are providing payments to those persons who are in institutions and who, according to the Age of Majority and Accountability Act, can no longer be paid. We will keep the existing capital grants of $5,000 per bed for new construction and $1,200 for remodelling existing structures. At the same time, under the regulations we will be able to increase those capital grants. So we are not removing anything; we are just making it possible for regulations to increase capital grants and maintenance grants and also grants—

Mr. Lewis: By how much?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, it is not specified, Mr. Speaker, but this will give us flexibility to do this through regulations. In the Act it specifies that the amounts will be no less than the existing amounts, and they can be increased by regulations.

Mr. Lewis: What about the per diem cost?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The per diem cost is 80 per cent. It remains at 80 per cent of the approved cost as it is now, but again in regulations it may be increased to more than 80 per cent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are not lessening grants. Through regulations we are making it possible to increase the capital grants and the maintenance costs.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 117.

The hon. member for Scarborough West wishes to speak to the bill?

Mr. Lewis: Not at length, but perhaps it being 6 of the clock—

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Guaranteed loans to industrial milk producers, statement by Mr. Stewart 2477

Guaranteed loans to industrial milk producers, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Good, Mr. Gaunt 2477

Plea bargaining in Ontario courts, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2478

Hydro transmission corridor, questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2479

Coroners' role in inquests, questions of Mr. Bales and Mr. Yaremko: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2479

Sunday closing hours, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Deans 2479

Minimum wage legislation, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Deans 2480

Winter works loan programme, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deans, Mr. MacDonald 2480

Non-returnable containers, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Deans 2481

Sale of dairies to US firms, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Worton 2481

Hole in basement of house, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Laughren 2481

Stock exchange commission rates, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. MacDonald 2481

Arnprior dam, questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Roy, Mr. Cassidy 2482

Provincial enumeration for assessment purposes, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Burr 2482

Admission of students to community colleges, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Reid, Mr. Foulds 2482

Government office building in Timmins, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Edighoffer 2483

Teenager sentenced to lash, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Lawlor 2484

Sale of firecrackers, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Deacon, Mr. Deans 2484

Gidon industries strike, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Bounsall 2485

Collective bargaining study, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Bullbrook 2485

Appeal of sentences in wiretapping case, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Renwick 2485

Property tax on mobile homes, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Reid 2486

Delay in exhumation, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman 2486

Judge's statement in Windsor, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence and Mr. Bales: Mr. Bounsall 2486

Election Act, bill to amend, Mr. Reid, first reading 2487

Provincial Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 2487

City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. G. Nixon, second reading 2488

Town of Preston, bill respecting, Mr. Rowe, second reading 2488

City of Sault Ste. Marie, bill respecting, Mr. Rhodes, second reading 2488

City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mr. J. R. Smith, second reading 2488
Third readings 2488
Survivorship Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 2488
Professional Engineers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 2489
Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 2489
Quieting Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 2489
Matrimonial Causes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 2489
Change of Name Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 2489
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, second reading 2491
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, second reading 2491
Third readings 2491
Royal assent to certain bills, the honourable the Lieutenant Governor 2492
Municipal Elections Act, bill respecting, Mr. McKeough, second reading 2492
Children's Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, on second reading 2519
Recess, 6 o'clock 2520

No. 64



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): Mr. Speaker, if I might, before we begin the proceedings this evening, draw the attention of the House to the presence in the east gallery of members and friends of the Dawes Road Ladies Progressive Conservative Association and ask the House to afford them a warm welcome.

Clerk of the House: The 21st order, resuming of the debate on second reading of Bill 117, An Act to amend the Children's Institutions Act.

CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS ACT

(*continued*)

Mr. Speaker: When we recessed at 6 o'clock, I believe the hon. member for Scarborough West had the floor.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Thank you for recalling that for me, Mr. Speaker. As I recall, we were giving second reading to the bill on the Children's Institutions Act, upgrading the amounts of money for capital cost and for operating expenses. Since this is an area which continues to interest me personally in some regard, and is integral to the whole field of mental health, I thought, perhaps, I could just make a couple of observations.

Of course the bill must be supported in principle. And the principle of extending the grants, as has been done to cover the ages 18 to 21—that's primarily the raison d'être for the bill—is a very good one and wholly to be applauded. The part of the bill which remains invidious, and I raise it, perhaps for the minister's subsequent consideration, is the 80 per cent on operating costs. Even though, admittedly, the regulations can provide a subsidy beyond that 80 per cent, it's invidious because this bill is meant to cover those youngsters profoundly and seriously disturbed enough to be confined to one of the treatment centres under the Children's Institutions Act.

This bill deals with those youngsters whose route to those treatment centres is separate from referral by children's aid societies. Now children's aid societies, based on the funding they receive through the Child Welfare Act, pay the whole cost for any ward—permanent or non-permanent—who enters such an institution.

The referral by way of non-children's aid society, by mental health clinics, by various physicians, by parents with the support of physicians, has on it an 80 per cent formula. It is not paid in full. And it sets out a very invidious kind of selection process about how much the state decides to tie individual families, in terms of their payment for their child's treatment, over how many months, years or whatever. Now, although all of us are extremely concerned about health costs generally, this seems to me to be one area where the application is unfair.

First, because it doesn't take into account, literally, the thousands upon thousands of dollars which parents inevitably have already assumed if they have a disturbed child who is ultimately sent to a treatment centre. It cannot begin to be calculated how much most parents have paid by way of specific support to keep the child going until the point at which a treatment centre placement becomes available. In addition to that, one cannot put a financial figure on the immense emotional stress and problems which the family has experienced, and burdens which the family has assumed by virtue of the persistent emotional disturbance prior to the treatment centre.

On top of that the costs in treatment centres are so high. I am sure they average somewhere between $35 and $45 a day now in most of the intensive treatment centres in Ontario. The length of stay varies from six months to five years depending on the disturbance with which one is dealing. Even a minor percentage paid by the parents is a tremendous financial cost. When you say to the parents involved: "We are subjecting you to a means test, we are going to look at your income, we are going to have to see what you can bear," it seems to me that is the ultimate indignity.

Finally the state has come to its senses. It says: "These kids deserve to go to a setting

other than through wards of children's aid societies, we agree that to take them through the court process was wrong, we are going to provide an alternative and more civilized route." Then to say to the parents: "You have to assume this additional cost," seems to me something that government should reconsider and perhaps discard.

When someone goes into an Ontario hospital or into a psychiatric wing of a general hospital, the costs that are assumed by individual families are minimal or negligible. I think that it should be so in this case as well, and that is an area to be given serious consideration by government.

I am sorry you couldn't see fit to remove that 20 per cent that is involved. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that if it is 20 per cent of say $40 a day, that is $8 a day. You multiply that by 365 days a year, there are no exceptions—what does that work out to; almost $3,000 a year. You tell me which families in the Province of Ontario can afford $3,000 a year by way of direct contribution to a treatment centre for the care of the child?

"Ah," you say, "my regulations give me the opportunity to upgrade the 80 per cent." But what a humiliating kind of business it is for the parents who are already anxious about what effect they have had in terms of the child's disturbance. How humiliating to feel as though there were a punitive application that they should pay yet more money—as though their transgression was being costed in dollars. I think there is a very real and decent case to be made in this one area of health care in particular for eliminating that special additional burden. We don't do it in other areas of mental health; we do do it in this one. It is very unfair; it is largely invidious; it does not take into account the past expenditures — financial and emotional — which the families have experienced. Maybe the minister, new to his portfolio, could give very serious thought to recommending to the Treasury Board—it wouldn't be very much money in fact—that that should be dispensed with.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to this bill? If not, the hon. minister?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Scarborough West. I was pleased to hear that he agrees with the principle that the subsidy should be increased and should be raised for those over 18 years of age.

With reference to an increase of more than 80 per cent, I think he has made some very valid points. As was indicated earlier, this legislation does not change anything. It just permits us to put it in the regulations whereby we will continue to pay no less than 80 per cent, and we could pay more. For this year, under the financial resources that we have been allocated, it is not possible to increase that percentage. However, it is an area that I think needs looking into and we certainly will give it every consideration.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Clerk of the House: The third order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

INSURANCE ACT

House in committee on Bill 96, An Act to amend the Insurance Act.

Mr. Chairman: When we rose last week, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) was discussing section 18. Everything was carried up to that point, I believe.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the House leader could bring us into his confidence. In the event that we finish committee stage on this tonight, could he tell us precisely what legislation will be considered later in the evening and in what order?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Yes, as I announced yesterday the next item of business will be Bill 109.

Mr. Cassidy: Bill what?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Bill 109.

Mr. Cassidy: And after that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: After that I intend to call the estimates for Natural Resources.

Mr. Cassidy: Could the hon. minister, still on a point of order, explain why the—

Mr. Chairman: This is not a point of order, but if we can clarify the order for the member, we probably could.

Mr. Cassidy: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. In fact, Mr. Bernier's bill was not in the list, I understand, that was given by the hon. minister yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I didn't say Mr. Bernier's bill; I said the estimates of Natural Resources.

Mr. Cassidy: No, I am saying—I beg your pardon; it was the hon. Minister for Social and Community Services' (Mr. Brunelle) bill that we just passed that was not on the list that was given out yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I apologize about that, but I think the bill wasn't of that great a significance that you weren't prepared to deal with it. The minister wanted it on, I called it; if you objected I think you should have objected at the time it came on.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On a point of order. Last Tuesday night an earlier section of this bill was discussed and at the same time the Workmen's Compensation Board was holding certain hearings. Prior to my going to the hearing of the Compensation Board I went to the minister and told him I had certain important contributions which I wished to make in this debate and asked if this bill was coming up. He said he did not think so. I asked if it did come up if he would send a messenger over to the compensation hearings and summon me back. He told me he would. The bill came up; the discussion took place. The sections which I wished to discuss were not discussed and I request your permission to revert to the earlier sections.

Mr. Chairman: We have carried everything up to—I made it quite clear we have carried everything up to section 18. We have to proceed in an orderly fashion.

Mr. Shulman: We have to believe the minister's words around here are worth something!

Mr. Chairman: Well—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If I can add to that very snide remark, I'd like to say that in regard to the business of the House the members of the opposition have just as much control over the amount of time it takes as I have. If I call an item and if the matter comes up as a result of the timing of the House, I regret I cannot help that.

Mr. Shulman: You could have very well sent one of the pages across as requested.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Why couldn't your whip do that?

Mr. Shulman: As it happened, surely the man who is bringing the bill in can send a messenger when specifically asked and agreeing to do so, and having assured me the bill was not coming up?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to become argumentative about the thing, but at the time this particular bill came onto the floor as I recall—and I stand to be corrected—I think the hon. member had left the buildings.

Mr. Shulman: I was over at the compensation hearings.

Mr. Chairman: It is not really a point of order anyway.

Mr. Shulman: It certainly is a point of order.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to the point of order—

Mr. Chairman: It wasn't really a point of order. There is nothing out of order of the House.

Mr. Renwick: Let me raise a point of order which is identical to the one that the member for High Park just raised. If the chairman and the other members of the committee of the whole House will look at the proceedings of Hansard for Tuesday evening, when this bill was dealt with, you will note the following dissertation which took place:

Mr. Chairman: **Mr. Deacon moves that clause 1 of subsection 2 of section 8 of the bill be deleted.**

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed wil please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it. I declare the motion lost and the subsection carried.

Any other comments, questions or amendments in any section up to section 19?

The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: **Mr. Chairman, I would like to—**

Mr. R. F. Nixon: **It is 10:30 isn't it?**

Mr. Lawlor: **Yes, it is dead on 10:30.**

Mr. Chairman: **Which section is it you want to discuss?**

Hon. A. Grossman **(Minister of Revenue): I'll bet he withdraws now.**

Mr. Lawlor: **No, I never withdraw; just disappear from the scene.**

Mr. Chairman: **The member has a quick amendment to section 19.**

Mr. Lawlor: No, no, no! I couldn't let the opportunity pass with respect to the gratuitous passenger, one of the greatest anomalies in human history.

I adjourn the debate, if that is what you want.

Mr. Roy: That is a good line to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Chairman: It is understood that this bill is carried up to section 18.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee of the whole House rise and report two bills—

I am saying to you, Mr. Chairman, on the remarks that were made by you at that time, when the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) indicated that he wanted to speak with respect to the gratuitous passenger section, there was absolutely no basis on which you could then say that it is understood the bill is carried up to section 18 and then resume the debate tonight on that basis.

I suggest that the unilateral gratuitous statement by the chairman that the bill had been carried up to section 18 is an inaccurate summary of what took place. The fact of the matter is that my colleague, the member for Lakeshore, wanted to speak on a clause preceding that and none of the clauses in fact were passed after the motion introduced by the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) was defeated.

I am simply saying, Mr. Chairman, that we in this party on this particular bill take the position that there was no debate following the amendment that was debated and lost on the motion by the member for York Centre, and the balance of the sections of this bill are still open for debate. And my colleague, the member for Lakeshore, is here to back up and support exactly what I have said in quoting him from the verbatim Hansard.

Mr. Chairman: As I recall it, there was a bit of confusion. In fact, I must admit I didn't hear the member for Lakeshore. I was listening—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): You are terribly deaf!

Mr. Chairman: It is not recorded in Hansard, I must say to the hon. member and—

Mr. S. Lewis: Allow us to go back.

Mr. Chairman: Well—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, this isn't a contest on a point of order. We are discussing an important bill. I think it is clear in Hansard. Let us revert to the sections which are contentious.

Mr. Chairman: Well, in view of the fact that there was confusion at the end, as I recall—there's a mistake in that where it says, "the member has an amendment;" really that should have read, "the minister has an amendment," so there are a couple of errors there. Would the hon. minister be willing to —we have carried up to and including section 8; that was carried after the amendment. I am sorry, I didn't hear the member. I heard afterward he was talking about the gratuitous section, but I didn't hear him here because of other discussions taking place.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We wanted to hear about Dean Wright!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, your hearing has become highly defective. When one is attending a meeting at Sutton Place of the select committee on—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! May I ask the hon. minister if he would be willing to discuss some of these earlier sections?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What was that on Bill 95?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister didn't answer the question on second reading, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: This is section 9, I understand.

Mr. Lawlor: In a roundabout route, yes, Mr. Chairman. It has actually to do with—

An hon. member: Round and round and round!

Mr. Lawlor: Why aren't services included within the ambit of the legislation? I mean, you are dealing with products and their distribution.

An hon. member: We are on the insurance bill.

Mr. Lawlor: We are on the insurance bill? That's the wrong bill, Mr. Chairman. Why don't people tell me these things?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let's go back to the Insurance Act.

Mr. Renwick: My colleague was dealing with services under the Insurance Act and he wants to continue.

Mr. Chairman: Any comments, questions or amendments up to and including section 18 then?

The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: You go ahead.

Mr. Lawlor: Are you going to do section 9?

An hon. member: That is after section 8.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to turn to section 14, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Section 14.

Mr. Shulman: Subsection 2a of section 14 reads as follows:

> No licence shall be issued to a corporation that carries on business as an insurance agent, broker or adjuster if the majority of its issued outstanding shares that entitles the holder to any voting rights, are owned beneficially or otherwise by a non-resident of Canada unless such corporation was so licensed on the 27th day of April, 1972.

Now, before I get into the section I want to ask the minister if a re-licencing is necessary every year—or once you have a licence is that licence good presumably for ever?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is good.

Mr. Shulman: Then what is the position the minister takes when a company with a majority of issued and outstanding shares owned by a resident of Canada—shares which are listed on the market—has those shares purchased by a non-resident? Are you suggesting those shares will not be transferable?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Up to that degree, up to the degree of the Act.

Mr. Shulman: This is very interesting, because it doesn't say that in here anywhere. What section of the Act allows you to refuse —or instructs them as trust companies that they may not transfer the beneficial ownership of a share?

Let's suppose I own 100 shares of Imperial Life which is a publicly owned company, and I decide to sell my shares on the market and they are purchased by John Jones, who lives in Buffalo—are you trying to suggest that there is something in here—if so I can't see it—that allows the trust company, The Guaranty Trust Company, to refuse to transfer those shares?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, the rules of disclosure.

Mr. Shulman: Well, of course we are going to disclose it. No one is suggesting it not be disclosed. What prevents the transfer? What in here, if anything?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Were you referring to some specific instance? Did you suggest—

Mr. Shulman: I gave you a specific example, Imperial Life Insurance.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The Imperial Life Insurance Company is not a broker or an adjuster.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I am sorry. I picked the name as an example. I'm giving you—well anyone, it doesn't matter—any Canadian corporation that has public stock. If you want, I can get you some specific names, though it really doesn't matter because it doesn't make any difference. What in this section stops me as a Canadian from selling my shares to the Americans? You have worded it badly.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, we will govern it in licensing and we will govern it through the rules of disclosure. We intend we will govern the industry by this particular provision in this Act.

Mr. Shulman: That's all very well, but all the Act says is "no licence shall be issued. . . ." You've already said that the licences are not renewable and once the company gets its licence it's got the licence. There is nothing in here about cancelling a licence.

Now let's take our mythical company again, that has its licence, that is owned by me as a Canadian, and I proceed to sell my shares over a period of time and they are gradually bought up by an American. What provision here allows you to cancel the licence?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If and when we found out that such was taking place then the licence you refer to would in fact be in jeopardy and open to cancellation.

Mr. Shulman: I understand you saying that, but we do rule by law in this province. What in the Act allows you to do that? All you say in the Act is "no licence shall be issued." And you have gone on to say that the company isn't going to need to have a licence issued, it has already had its licence issued. Now what in the Act, regardless of

your good intentions or your bad intentions—and I am not sure which they are at this moment—about cancellation, gives you the right to cancel in the Insurance Act?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The fact that he is going beyond the bounds of the suggestion that was in the terms of the bill. That is to say that if the outstanding shares go beyond that which we are suggesting, on the information being supplied to us, we will in fact cancel his licence, if necessary.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I don't believe you can cancel licences unless you have the legal authority to cancel the licence. Would you mind telling me what section gives you that authority?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As I am informed by my officials, the regulations will state that more than 50 per cent of the shares cannot be held, of course, outside the country, and this would place the licence in jeopardy under the licence requirements.

Mr. Shulman: Which section of the licence requirements would put it in jeopardy? I don't believe you have the right, and I think your officials would probably agree with me, to put ways of cancelling in regulations. You have to have that in the bill, and there is nowhere in the bill that it says that; or if there is, I'd like to know where it is. I've searched and I can't find it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am simply telling the hon. member that the regulations stipulate the guidelines. If it goes beyond this, then his licence, as I said, will be in jeopardy and will be open for cancellation as he comes back to us for renewal.

Mr. Shulman: Just a minute, "if he comes back for renewal"; just two minutes ago you said they don't have to come for renewal. You said once they get their licence, they have their licence. Let's get that straight once and for all. Do they have to have renewals?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But within the terms of the Act—

Mr. Shulman: Do they have to have renewals? Were you wrong the first time, when you said—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, if I said no, I was wrong.

Mr. Shulman: All right.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: All right.

Mr. Shulman: Well, we've got that. You're wrong on that. Let's go on to the next point. Where in the Act does it say they have to have renewals and how often do they have to have renewals?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is obviously in some other section of the Act which I don't have before me.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps you should find it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll find it for you.

Mr. Shulman: All right, before we go on to the next section.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a little difficulty here. I wasn't really prepared for this Act being called in committee of the whole House. I did want to talk, as I did on second reading, about the question of coverage for gratuitous passengers. I thought I had extracted an undertaking from the minister that he was concerned about the qualification of gross negligence, and—

Mr. Chairman: What section is that?

Mr. Singer: That's section 9. I apologize for asking the House to revert back to section 9, because we jumped very quickly into 14. My only excuse, Mr. Chairman, is that—

Mr. Chairman: We jumped from 18 to 14.

Mr. Singer: —this came on us a little quickly tonight. I am sure, because of the minister's undertaking in second reading about this concern in relation to gross negligence and his concern that he shares with me that the word "gross" should probably be removed, that at this point it is appropriate to talk about that and to ask the minister specifically—

Mr. Chairman: Which section are you on?

Mr. Singer: Section 9. As I say, I am apologizing to all the House, including the member for High Park.

Mr. Chairman: We are not allowed to bring this matter up. We are not dealing with section 9.

Mr. Shulman: I am perfectly willing, but can we get one point settled before we go on?

Mr. Singer: The minister is obviously searching out the information and answer to

you and I am sure he is going to come back to you very shortly.

Mr. Chairman: Have you—

Mr. Singer: But while there is a pause, while the minister searches out his information, I would like to ask about this undertaking in connection with gross negligence.

Mr. Chairman: You would like to make a speech.

Mr. Singer: My plea is a very simple one, and I think very readily understandable; that is—notwithstanding what a previous Premier, a long time removed, might have felt about a particular gratuitous passenger that he had, and the nibbling away that we've been able to do over the years—that the liability to gratuitous passengers should be the same as the standard negligence liability in the Province of Ontario. It should not be qualified by the word "gross", whatever that may mean; and it seems to mean at this stage, Mr. Chairman, whatever a particular judge seems to think it might mean.

We can get all sorts of legalistic qualifications and definitions about "gross". I recognize that there have to be companion amendments, perhaps in this Act and in the Highway Traffic Act, but I wonder at the extent to which the minister, who seemed to be in agreement with me on second reading, is now prepared to commit himself and the government, because I think this qualification should be removed and that the liability should relate to negligence, not "gross" negligence.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes Mr. Chairman, regrettably I didn't bring the same pile with me as I had the other evening; otherwise I could read the document to the hon. member. As a matter of fact, it has been sent to me. I don't have to read the entire thing. I made a reference to the changes that we effected in this particular occasion. I expressed my sympathy and my agreement with your concern and asked them to initiate the necessary changes.

Mr. Singer: Could I ask the minister a further question? I am not quite sure, but is there at this stage any amendment necessary to the Insurance Act to ensure that its additional reflection in the Highway Traffic Act will be complete, or is all that is needed from here on in amendments to the Highway Traffic Act?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'm so informed.

Mr. Singer: Fine. And the minister is advising us that it is government policy that that amendment will be produced in due course?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I cannot state government policy. I am stating exactly the commitment that I gave to the hon. member that evening. I complied with it I think, one or two days later, on May 8, a copy of which I am prepared to supply to the hon. member if he so desires.

Mr. Singer: Okay, let me see a copy.

Mr. Chairman: Section 9. The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, having arrived late but come early, and since the member has opened up the debate with respect to gratuitous passenger liability; you know, in the balmy days as a student at law at Osgoode Hall, this clause was the chief example used to us by the professorate in that regard as to the power, the incredible power, of the insurance industry in this province; what they were able coercively to bring into effect for their own benefit against the common weal and against the interest of drivers as a whole. It was mentioned over and over again by men like Willis and by Wright—God save his immaculate soul—Cecil Wright. How men can be so eminent and with such incredible intellectual powers and be so little remembered seems always a mystery to me. Anyhow, Cecil Wright was a master of the law, which means that he covered omnivorously vast territories in all its complexity, and when it got most complex he most rejoiced in it. In any event his statements were directed against this particular clause in the Insurance Act brought into being in this province and in other states of the United States. Some states, of course, had the temerity to resist the powers of the insurance industry. And here, among the latter day saints, we see this particular piece of iniquity being removed from legislation; the section as it presently reads—subsection 9 of 225 of the Insurance Act:

> Notwithstanding anything contained herein to the contrary, every contract evidenced by a motor vehicle liability policy shall for the purposes of this section be deemed to provide all the types of coverage maintained in section 217, but the insurer is not liable to be a claimant (a) where the claim results from bodily injury

to, or the death of, any person being carried in or upon or getting on to or alighting from an automobile.

In other words, in cases of commercial vehicles of various kinds—buses, taxi cabs, and whatnot—a person getting into those vehicles was insured under the overall coverage based upon a fiduciary relationship. But those people, riding in a gratuitous way, paying nothing to ride on a vehicle, were absolutely left out of any form of protection whatsoever. For 15 or 17 years that particular piece of blandishment was left in our legislation. Finally—and I well recall the memory of Cecil Wright in this particular regard—it may stand as a memorial that you have seen fit, having introduced no-fault insurance in a limited and nugatory and reservationist way, in which you bring in most of these things which affect insurance, that you finally see fit to take the matter out, albeit remaining within the ambit of section 218 and the $50,000 limited coverage. But this is a proper moment for celebration and blessing in this House, to see what is considered in the legal profession—except for those who defend automobile interest cases—by and large in terms of equity, in terms of large mindedness, as one of the most grotesque pieces of legislation on the books—

Mr. Singer: Most advanced minister!

Mr. Lawlor: —finally eliminated. So I stand here, having been given the opportunity to give my voice and a moment of my time to seeing the expiration; I give the obituary, and thank heaven the creature is dead.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 9 stand as part of the bill?

Section 9 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before section 14? If not, maybe the—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, could the minister explain briefly to us the deletion of the clause in section 12 of the bill? In clause 12 of the bill, as I understand it, there is a deletion of a substantial clause which I have marked as a marginal note in my copy of the bill with the words, "or a member of a mutual fire, weather or livestock insurance corporation carrying on business solely on the premium note plan."

Is that simply an amendment which was overlooked at the time when we dealt, a year ago I believe, with the amendments related to mutual fire and livestock insurance corporations carrying on business solely on the premium note plan?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I didn't have as much interest then, of course, in the Act as I have at the present time, and I think that what the hon. member is saying is correct, except that I will give him my interpretation of why this is here, because there are certain members of those mutuals that were not licensed who desired to be licensed because of the status, apparently, that it gave them within the company, no matter their size or importance within the company. And this amendment was requested by them and that is the reason it is here.

Sections 12 and 13 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: On section 14, could we have the answer of the hon. minister for the member for High Park?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would say that in part 14 of the Insurance Act, section 342:

> (1) The superintendent may issue to any person who has complied with this Act a licence authorizing such person to carry on business as an insurance agent subject to this Act, the regulations and the terms of the licence.

That is what takes care of it.

Mr. Shulman: Would the minister repeat that please? A little louder and a little slower.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes. You can refer to it, of course, if you want to yourself. But since I am available I will read it a little louder and a little slower.

Part 14, which refers to—and this is the reason I suggested to you before the corporations were different than the terms of the Act to which we are making this apply—

> Agents, brokers, adjusters, licences of insurance agents: The superintendent may issue to any person who has complied with this Act a licence authorizing such person to carry on business as an insurance agent subject to this Act, to the regulations and the terms of the licensing.

The superintendent also, obviously, has the right to reject.

Mr. Shulman: Where does it say that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I read it.

Mr. Shulman: Where does it say it may be rejected? There is not a word in there.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Section 3427.

Mr. Shulman: I beg your pardon, read it. Perhaps the minister has read something saying "the superintendent may issue a licence". But nowhere has he read anything where the superintendent may withdraw a licence.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Under the same section on page 150 of the Insurance Act, subsection 8:

> A licence issued under this section or section 343, may be revoked by the superintendent if after due investigation and hearing he determines that the holder of the licence has contravened any provision of this Act, or the regulation, in his operation as an insurance agent, or—

and so on.

Mr. Shulman: Now we come to the meat of it all and this is really what I have been working up to. I will accept the minister's explanation at this point that he is going to put this in the regulation and that will carry it. However, whoever has drawn this Act up, and I am quite sure it wasn't the minister, has missed the whole point.

I presume that this section 14(2)(a) is to ensure that corporations that carry on business as insurance agents, brokers or adjusters are in effect run by Canadians. This is what the minister is trying to do I presume.

I would like to ask the minister what percentage of the stock of a corporation does he think has to be held in order to have effective control? Does he think it is 51 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would say so, yes.

Mr. Shulman: Well I am glad that the member for York Centre is here, because the minister is about to get an education which I would have hoped someone would have given him long before this.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Would you believe me that it is effective in this particular case as a beginning?

Mr. Shulman: Well it is a joke, and if nobody has told you a joke it is time someone did.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well sometimes you are a joke too.

Mr. Shulman: You are going to learn something tonight and it is about time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Fine!

Mr. Shulman: Any corporation that wishes to take over another corporation doesn't go out and bid for 51 per cent of the shares. It doesn't even bid for 49 per cent of the shares. It is a rare corporation that cannot be taken over with a third. You have not done a darn thing in this section—nothing. It is a great deal of window-dressing. You have been had. You have been fooled by somebody in the insurance industry who has somehow persuaded someone in your department, who doesn't know anything at all about the subject, that by putting in the majority of shares you are keeping the Americans from taking control of these things. It has no effect whatsoever.

If I run an American corporation and I want to take over any one of these firms, all I have to do is go out and buy, just to make it as simple as possible, 49 per cent of the stock. You don't need 49 per cent. I could probably get away with as little as 15 or 20 per cent, because all of the other shareholdings are spread out over many hundreds of people. Control often is as little as 10 per cent or even less.

When you say here that no American may take over more than 51 per cent of the shares, so what? They don't want more than 51 per cent. They don't want more than 50 per cent. They want control. If you buy the controlling block, which will be considerably less than 50 per cent, you have control.

Effectively you have turned the corporation from a Canadian corporation to an American corporation, but you haven't contravened this regulation whatsoever.

This regulation produced great headlines in the Globe and the Star: Look what the government is doing. They are protecting these things being taken over by Americans.

You are not doing a darn thing. If I'm an American corporation I can come in and take over just as I did before. You have worded it badly, just as badly as the earlier section, which, unfortunately I am precluded from speaking on. I hope the member for York Centre will come in on this and explain the facts of corporate life to the minister.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I might just point out the minister's other Acts which relate to foreign control use the figure of 25 per cent and 10 per cent. It is an important thing, I think. I was pleased at the time that this was our basis of deciding at what point we have to be concerned about foreign ownership—25 per cent, and 10 per cent in any single owner.

As the member for High Park says, it has been well known that a single voting block of in excess of 25 per cent can be effective control if the rest of the stock—the other 75 or less per cent—is distributed among a great many shareholders. I think that if the minister is being consistent with the other legislation that his department has introduced in the last two or three years, that a figure of 25 per cent foreign-controlled is the figure that should be used here, and 10 per cent in any single foreign shareholder.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That may be so. Those percentages are used in another quarter. It may be that in due course we will use them here as well. At the moment, we have chosen to put this figure into the bill and I intend to stand on that very point.

Mr. Shulman: Then you are not really against American ownership then.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes I am; a lot more than a lot of other people.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister surely will not just stand on what he has actually introduced here, because he has shown reasonableness before in amending situations which are not consistent, and I would ask him to be consistent here. What difference would it make to him when he's announced to the public that he is doing something to control foreign takeovers? Why would he not consider right now amending this clause in the same way that he has amended the trust and loan companies, the insurance companies, the brokers, all the legislation he has been bringing in the last two or three years? Do it the same way. I ask the minister to be consistent and bring in such an amendment at this point.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We believe that inherent in this bill is the fact that if anyone does hold more than 51 per cent of the shares, himself or on behalf of a company, he must be a resident of Canada. We think that that is a step in the right direction. If further consideration is needed, we will do that in due course.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister cannot pretend to be so naive. As the minister in charge of Consumer and Financial Affairs, he must have been exposed to this argument almost ad nauseam, in the Business Corporations Act, in any piece of corporate legislation, in the business of takeovers, in the business of the whole of the presentations made to you by Professor Willis and others with respect to mergers, the 49 per cent is a totally and completely meaningless figure.

Now there is a conundrum involved in seeking to set a figure and that has mesmerized us all. To take an adamantine stand in this regard tonight, on 49 per cent, and saying you are willing to stick by it, is a totally empty gesture. You say that you have some sympathy and some understanding in this regard and you wish to protect the Canadian insurance industry. But you can't pretend to be wanting to do so with a figure of that kind.

You should amend your figure to 25 per cent. Then it would have some relevance and some meaning. Anything short of that—even that—you know that corporation control can be held easily with three per cent, with five per cent. It is just commonplace in pyramiding corporations to have that set-up. Your 49 per cent is a complete myth, an illusion engendered out of impure air.

To take a stand in that particular regard the minister ought to give very serious consideration to bringing that figure down in consonance with legislation that you have already on your books which had a bit of meaning, which is at least a gesture of intrepidity in the direction of defending Canadian interests in this regard. To do what you are doing tonight is nebulous, and neither here nor there, and I would ask you to reconsider your position.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this just a little further, because thinking back in the takeovers, I can't think of one that took as much as 50 per cent, when an American corporation came in here to take over. It was always done with considerably less.

But what really intrigues me is, and I am most interested in knowing, whether this is being done deliberately or through ignorance. I would like to think it was being done through ignorance, because if it was being done deliberately I will have very bad thoughts about the minister. If he is doing it through lack of knowledge of the subject then I can forgive him. But there are only two possibilities here. Either he knows not what he does, or he knows very well what he is doing, which is nothing. But to come out and say with great flair, and we saw the great flair which he presented: "We are protecting the insurance industry from being taken over by the Americans," and to put in a joker such as he has done here, which in effect does nothing, absolutely noth-

ing, as an amendment it won't stop a single takeover.

All right, let us presume he has done it through ignorance, let's give him the benefit of the doubt. Yet when we come in here and people who are expert in the field, and I point to my friend from York Centre who is an expert in the field, point this out to him, he says: "No I am adamant. We are standing there." Then suddenly we worry. It is not done through ignorance. It is being done deliberately in an attempt to fool the public. And if that is what it is he is going to have a rough time. Which is it Mr. Minister? Is it ignorance, or is it deliberate?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I wish to state once again—and I will put it in another word, maybe—that under the regulations 51 per cent must be held by a resident licensee of Canada. And this is the measure of control at this particular time.

Mr. Shulman: And that is no measure whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And it has been accepted by a good number of the people that I have spoken to.

Mr. Shulman: I am sure you have spoken to all the insurance companies.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I have spoken to no one but Canadians. And I am satisfied.

Mr. Shulman: Well who have you spoken to? This intrigues me. Who has the minister spoken to to get his advice on this subject? Would he confide with us? Who are the experts? Will he tell us?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), and the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 14 carry as part of the bill?

Mr. Shulman: No, not for a long while, Mr. Chairman. We are waiting to see if the minister is going to respond.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Why don't you try an amendment and get it over with? Because I'm sticking.

Mr. Shulman: I couldn't hear your reply, if there was a reply.

Mr. Lawlor: There was no reply, a blank wall.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Delete the words "the majority of"—

An hon. member: Are you moving an amendment?

Mr. Deacon: I am moving an amendment—

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Deacon: —that the words "the majority of" be deleted and the words "in excess of" be substituted therefor in the third line of subsection of 2(a). I will have to write this out.

Mr. Shulman: Well while the motion is being written out, may I just ask the minister why he seems so adamant? Why won't he do what is obviously the correct thing to do here? Does he have any explanation?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We believe that what we are doing here is a start. It is a beginning in the right field and we are going to apply this. If it needs further change in the future, we will change it further. If that is not sufficient for the hon. member, I am sorry.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry too, because it obviously will not be sufficient for me. I don't think it will be sufficient for your own backbenchers and it—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Fine!

Mr. Shulman: —certainly won't be sufficient for the public when it gets into the press, because they have been conned and the press is very well aware of it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think you are quite wrong!

Mr. Shulman: Can the minister explain to me, if he really doesn't want the insurance industry taken over by American interests, why he is not willing to put any teeth into the section? Why he won't insist it be 25 per cent? Why is it—who has got to him? Who has said what to him? Who are the experts you have spoken of? Why are you so embarrassed to tell us who they are?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I said to the hon. member that the people I have spoken to have all been involved in the Canadian industry and they are satisfied with this.

Mr. Shulman: Would the minister be willing to name one of those people? If there are experts who disagree, I would certainly like to have a chance to discuss it with them.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In broad terms, I'll tell him that everyone I have spoken to in the adjusting field agrees with it.

Mr. Shulman: Will he name one? Can he name one? I doubt it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I can name one.

Mr. Shulman: I challenge the minister to name one of the experts he has spoken to who agrees with this section. Can he name one person?

Mr. Singer: Sure, his advisers.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! I have now Mr. Deacon—

Mr. Lawlor: Let's have it here in this particular regard—

Mr. Chairman: Order please, member for Lakeshore! I have Mr. Deacon's motion now, may I place it?

Mr. Lawlor: It is being written out. I don't think it is quite ready yet.

Mr. Shulman: It is ready.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, let me get the torrent off my chest.

Mr. Chairman: All right. The member for Lakeshore may have the floor now. I'll read it when he finishes.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deacon: I have given it to the chairman.

Mr. Lawlor: Surely you are the Minister of Corporate Affairs, and within your demesne is the whole of business? You are—I wouldn't attribute what my colleague says, it must be perfect. Leave out the Americans, leave out foreign takeovers.

Surely, as the minister of this particular department, no one could be more aware than you are of what control means and what effective control constitutes in the modern world. It has nothing whatsoever to do with mathematical entities of 51 and 49 per cent. Do you agree with that? I mean you know that, don't you?

Sure you do. I feel it is almost a victory to have achieved that nod. It is Caesar going to sleep; that is what it comes to.

If that's the case then, Mr. Chairman, and the minister means what he says, he introduces legislation with a purpose in order to forfend, knowing right well that 49 per cent is a nebulous and completely empty figure, meaning nothing whatsoever in this particular context, and knowing that inroads and takeovers may be constituted with far less.

Even if you moved to 25 per cent, we would know that it left an enormous girth, a swath of movement, for anyone really interested in moving into the arena. Is it that those who advise you, in their self-interest, are desirous of being taken over and therefore wish to keep this incredible figure before us? In other words, they prefer to sell out the industry, as far as they are concerned, in return for the gains derivable. That seems to be the only basis upon which that advice could possibly be given.

Therefore the minister has very little alternative, if he wants to place any teeth, any meaning, any rationality, any basis, any foundation whatsoever into the legislation being presented. Why bother if this is the case? Why give us the trouble and waste the time of this House in face of clauses that are so vacuous and totally unmeaning, in—the minister's own words.

Mr. Shulman: A public relations gesture!

Mr. Lawlor: One despairs! What kind of hypocrisy is this, if you know and then go ahead and do it? Surely you can move in some direction. If 25 per cent isn't enough, maybe it should be 33, if you can go as far as one-third, as the hon. member indicates. But this!

Mr. Chairman: I'll place the motion then. Mr. Deacon moves that the words "the majority of" in the third line of subsection (2a) of section 14 be deleted and the words "in excess of 25 per cent of" be substituted therefor. Those in favour of Mr.—

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Shulman: Wait a minute.

Mr. Deacon: I would like to have the minister explain to me—

An hon. member: We should have a copy of that.

Mr. Deacon: I'm sorry I don't have copies of this, because it's hard for me to understand why the minister wouldn't bring in such a motion himself.

Mr. Singer: I agree.

Mr. Deacon: It's hard to believe that the minister would have legislation pertaining

to stockbrokers in the investment industry and almost every other aspect of the financial community where there has been a feeling that control must be kept in Canada and the criterion that has been accepted by his department for control consistently has been in excess of 25 per cent.

Now to me, it's wrong for the minister to sit there tonight and say: "We'll think about it later on," when he has already told the people of this province that he is doing something to remove the possibility of further foreign takeovers in this business. Does he not realize that we already have a very substantial proportion of our insurance broker business, our insurance agency business and our adjusting business controlled by foreign corporations?

This isn't something that's forcing all of them back to 25 per cent; he's accepting the status quo. I hope that sometime he's going to come up with something that drives toward Canadian control of all this aspect of industry, as well as others. I think this is what we're after in the long run, but surely in legislation that's dealing with the status quo he should recognize the same criterion as he recognizes in other financial institutions.

Now, would the minister please not just say that 51 per cent of majority control is what his criterion is here, and tell us why he doesn't accept the same in other aspects of the financial world? His department and his predecessors have, in my view, wisely recognized that majority of the voting shares isn't the criterion for control; it's effective control. I think that my colleague from Downsview and I and others have argued before about this use of the word "effective." When we have tried to use that in legislation, the minister and his predecessors have said "You've got to define it," and they've used 25 per cent as the definition.

This is what we're asking you to accept tonight. Actually, we should probably have included 10 per cent in the hands of any single foreign shareholder as well, but I haven't included that. I think it's important we do that, but at this time, in writing it out in a hurry, I didn't take the time to do that. But I implore the minister and the other members of the government party to recognize that this is a charade in the form that it is before us. I'm pleased that the member for High Park has brought it forcibly before us, and I ask him and all the members of the House to support this amendment.

Mr. Lawlor: My feeling is he won't do it; he looks wholly obtuse. I will put money on it.

Mr. Shulman: I rise to support this amendment. Quite honestly, this is one of the most disturbing things that I've seen happen in this House.

Mr. Deacon: It's just one of many disturbing things from this minister.

Mr. Shulman: But this minister came in with an attitude that indicated he was willing to look at it with an open mind.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will disturb you the next time you want to come around.

Mr. Shulman: He gave us the impression—and I'm beginning to wonder how much was impression—that he had an open mind; he really was seriously interested in reform—

Mr. Lawlor: The minister coming in with an open mind?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Lakeshore surprises me.

Mr. Shulman: —and really was seriously interested in preventing American control of industries that came under his department. And with great fanfare he came into this House in this open way and said: "Look what we're doing. Down in Ottawa they may not care about Americans, but we're going to do something. This is me, the great Eric Winkler, and I'll show you. We'll bring in things with teeth, and we'll start with the insurance industry."

It was the biggest snow job I've ever seen since I've been in this Legislature. Usually when that government sets out to do bad things, which it does periodically, at least it has the guts to do them openly, but this is a straight snow job.

There are two possibilities, Mr. Chairman. One is that it was originally set up by the minister as a snow job—and I hate to believe that, even yet, although I'm approaching that position very rapidly.

In other words, it was a public relations gesture in order to persuade members of this Legislature, and the public of Ontario, that the government with this bill seriously intends to prevent American takeovers of the insurance industry.

Now, I am still giving the minister a chance to disprove me on that and I hope he will. But my hopes are getting smaller.

The other possibility—and this is the one I took when I first read the bill—is, well he is new in there. He doesn't know what he is doing. He is badly advised, and we know that the advisers he has are the same ones that poor old Art Wishart had, and they are not too smart on this particular subject. And they are certainly not as smart as the people they are dealing with, the insurance companies, the insurance industry.

And the advisers, those unnamed advisers, whose names we can't get, who the minister has boasted he has spoken to—all of them think this is great. I am sure they do. I am sure they do. And I can well understand the minister's reluctance to name them. In his position I would be reluctant too.

But the second possibility, the possibility that the minister didn't know what he was doing, has now been removed. He must be aware at this point that control of a corporation does not require 50 per cent of the stock. Effective control of a public corporation comes with considerably less.

Now there are only two conclusions we can come to. And we are going to come to them very quickly. Now that he does know it, what is he going to do? If he accepts this amendment we will know that he really is serious in his desire to prevent the insurance industry being taken over by US ownership.

If he rejects this amendment, no matter with what mealy words he uses—and he has used a number of them tonight—"This is a first step"—hogwash. "We are going to look at it further"—hogwash. "We intend to really do the right thing"—hogwash. We don't believe your words any more. We now believe your deeds, and this one stinks.

Now I ask you right now if you are either going to follow up what you say and accept this amendment, or else we'll know from here on in to look at everything you say because you speak with a forked tongue.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If that were so, I'm certainly not the only one!

Mr. Shulman: I believe that. I believe the minister speaks quite correctly. He is not the only one on that side that speaks with a forked tongue.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I said you, my friend; not anyone else.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, personalities should be forgotten!

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a few words. Coming from a municipality with many insurance companies, one of which has already been taken over by an American corporation, let me say this, I would respectfully suggest that the minister concentrate on the words of his leader, the Premier of this province (Mr. Davis), when he was critical of the federal government for their foreign policies. Think seriously of what the Premier has said in the last few weeks.

I am sure the minister would then feel that this amendment has a great deal of merit and should be put in just to keep your legislation in common with other legislation which has affected other financial institutions. We have said that the only curtailment of foreign control has been in our financial institutions. This would bring it much better into line, and perhaps if the Premier of this province were here tonight he would have to, in good conscience, support the amendment himself after what he said in Ottawa just last week.

Mr. Ruston: He speaks with a forked tongue too!

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, we are not asking for anything unreasonable. We are not asking for anything which is not compatible with previous government policy, as it deals with foreign control and takeover of financial institutions. So surely in all seriousness the minister must reconsider his position in the light of the statement—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Good: —made by the Premier of this province just last week in Ottawa. There is just no alternative but to accept this amendment. It is ridiculous.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Do you agree with that, John?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): You have got to, Eric. You have got to accept it.

Mr. Chairman: Ready to place the motion? The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: I would like to speak about the amendment and comment about another aspect of it. I am not all that worked up about the amendment, but not because I agree with the way the minister phrased it. If one thinks that the insurance brokerage and insurance agency business will benefit people of the Province of Ontario by being subject to a degree of Canadian ownership,

then I think the minister has no alternative but to accept the motion which is before him, when he has regard to the amendment passed by this Legislature relating to loan and trust corporations back in 1970. But I trust, Mr. Chairman, the committee will excuse me for being a little bit jaundiced about limiting the ownership of the insurance brokerage and insurance agency business in the Province of Ontario, without some correlative responsibilities being placed upon either the insurance industry or upon the insurance brokers and insurance agents with respect to the rates of premiums which are charged in this province. I tend to think that we have not had an adequate statement of policy from the government.

Mr. Chairman, the caution I introduce is that there has been substantial pressure—and I have been one who agrees with the pressure — to force the government to recognize there was a problem with respect to the encroachment of foreign ownership, in many cases principally American ownership, and control over the industrial and other sectors of the Province of Ontario. But having said that, we do not have to stand up on every single instance that the government introduces such a provision and clap for it without an adequate explanation by the government.

Now let me put this very clearly. We have supported federally the limitation on foreign ownership of chartered banks—and when I say we, I am talking about the New Democratic Party. We have supported the limitation on foreign ownership with respect to life insurance companies. We have supported in this Legislature the limitation with respect to foreign ownership in connection with the loan and trust corporations—particularly the trust corporations—as set out in the statute and on the very basis of the proposal made by the member for High Park and incorporated in the amendment by the member for York Centre.

But let us remember that the insurance industry which determines the rates of premiums charged to people in the Province of Ontario for insurance coverage in the automobile field—I am speaking about the non-life field—in the fire field, in the latest example with respect to tenants or householders' policies which we have read about in the newspapers, leaves something to be desired on the energy with which the industry concerns itself about lowering premiums.

Now in the general insurance field the industry in this province is for practical purposes substantially foreign-owned and controlled, regardless of the provisions of the General Insurance Act and the protective provisions with respect to their obligations to maintain reserves to pay off claims against them.

But let's not think for one moment the insurance agency field is all it seems. All of the agents are agents for companies, they are not agents for the insured person; let's be perfectly clear about that.

An agent under the government's Insurance Act in this province is an agent of an insurance company or companies—many of them have multiple agencies. He is not my agent, to go out and get me the best price he can get. By and large, there are substantially more—very many more—licensed insurance agencies in the Province of Ontario than there are brokers.

The brokers are very limited in number. Indeed, until a very few years ago there were very few brokerage licences available. At least a broker holds himself out as a middle man, to act, if necessary, for me in placing insurance, in shopping for the purpose of getting me the best insurance rate.

That's not what happens in the controlled field of the insurance agency and the insurance business in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Deacon: Oh, it sometimes does.

Mr. Renwick: Not too often.

Mr. Deacon: It depends on the agent.

Mr. Renwick: I am simply saying that the insurance agents as such are tied to particular companies and do not shop. Brokerage firms, by their nature, shop.

If I had my way, there wouldn't be an insurance agency in the Province of Ontario —they would all be brokers. And they'd all be required to go out and shop for the best rate that they can get.

Now let's not kid ourselves. We all know that by and large there is no competition on premium rates in the field of automobile insurance, in the field of fire insurance and the field of other miscellaneous coverage in the province. I think we have got to go back to fundamental principles. I think we must extend protection not on the basis of some nationalistic surge in which we are engaged, but for the purpose of protecting the people of the Province of Ontario to be certain that they get the best insurance rates. One of the ways that I question is whether we should protect the insurance brokerage businesses and the insurance agency businesses.

There is nothing that I know of on the record which indicates to me that they act for or in the interests of forcing the lowering of premiums in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! May I determine how that relates to this particular amendment?

Mr. Renwick: What we are saying in this section, Mr. Chairman, very simply is that there will be a degree of Canadian control of the insurance brokerage and agency business. I want to know from the minister where did the impetus come? Did it come from the cerebral ruminations of the minister or of the cabinet—

Mr. Singer: That is a good phrase!

Mr. Renwick: —of the Province of Ontario, be they ruminations in a vacuum or otherwise?

Mr. Singer: From the cerebral office.

Mr. Renwick: Did they come from that, or was there some outside pressure by persons who said, and I am going to put it in rather cold terms: "We operate a pretty cosy closed-shop operation in the Province of Ontario. We don't want to be subjected to the international competition of the insurance markets of the world. We want to protect our little operation here in the province?

Because if that is the case—if the government is going to impose this kind of protection for that particular limited field of insurance agency companies and insurance brokerage companies—then there have got to be correlative obligations imposed upon them. Otherwise we will continue to find that the premium rates in a wide variety of fields are subject to no government regulation, are subject to every conceivable indication of cartel operation and the stabilization of rates by a method which is insulated from any marketplace. We are going to find ourselves more and more in the hands of the insurance companies, which this government is not prepared to tackle.

The government knows very well that it is beyond the control of this government to deal with the general insurance business. If the government had any real guts about this problem it would face up to what it is going to do about the general insurance companies, Canadian owned, Canadian incorporated, provincially owned, provincially incorporated, United Kingdom owned, United Kingdom incorporated, United States owned, United States incorporated, that are the major insurers in the Ontario market.

If one looks at the list that is published annually by the superintendent of insurance in the Ontario Gazette, that is a long list of companies that are licensed; or he could look in the yellow pages, if one wants to tiptoe lightly through those for that purpose, to determine the general insurance group companies which control the insurance market in this province. I am simply saying that you are not doing anything by providing this degree of protection for the brokerage and agency business. The government doesn't set the rates. The rates are set by people that this government refuses, and has refused over the years, to control with respect to their rate-fixing mechanism. There has been no government body that has the obligation to review rate changes in the insurance business.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order please!

With respect, that has nothing to do with this particular amendment. It's foreign ownership.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely right on what we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman: No, it is a different direction completely, in my opinion.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about an endeavour by the government—

Mr. Chairman: The discussion has to do with the degree of ownership, 25 per cent, as suggested in the amendment.

Mr. Renwick: We are talking about the degree of Canadian ownership.

Mr. Chairman: Right!

Mr. Renwick: I am saying to the minister that if he is talking about effectively controlling the insurance business in the Province of Ontario for the benefit of Ontario residents, in terms of premium rates, he is not even marginally dealing with it by providing this degree of protection to a very limited number of people who control these businesses, without imposing any other obligations on them.

I want to know from the minister, specifically, where did the impetus come from? What is the reason he selects this narrow segment of the insurance business? Where does he think there is going to be any real tangible benefit to the people of the Prov-

ince of Ontario by providing this kind of legislation?

I'm quite happy to listen to any rationale, because like every other member of the assembly I am concerned about the rationale by which we assert the effectiveness of Ontario or Canadian control of basic industries.

This is not a basic industry. They don't fix the rates. They don't establish any rates. They don't affect the premiums. They act as agents for the companies. They are generally closely-held bodies. They are not generally publicly held, and my guess is that is why the minister stumbled into the trap about the 50 per cent.

I personally don't know of any of the brokerage firms in Toronto which have a public holding. There may very well be some of them, one or two or three; not very many. Most of them are family agency businesses which have developed into larger businesses; or they are general brokerage houses which have, over the time, become participants in an international market in the insurance business.

I want to know why the minister is going to protect this industry? If he is going to protect it, and has reasons for doing it, he can't possibly do other than support the amendment that has been introduced.

On the other hand, there is the other side of the coin. In cold hard terms, what does this do to reduce the premiums which are payable by all of the persons who deal either with insurance brokers or insurance agents in placing their car insurance, in placing their fire insurance or placing any other form of general miscellaneous insurance.

If he can tell me one single way in which the premiums of a citizen of the Province of Ontario are going to be reduced by this kind of protective device, I will support it. I have very grave reservations about the introduction of this kind of an amendment to the Insurance Act at this particular time, because it happens to be said, if we introduce this kind of general legislation it must be for everybody's benefit.

You know, Mr. Chairman, the minister knows, everyone in the House knows, everyone in the Province of Ontario knows, that if you want to get a policy of insurance from a general insurance company, you go to an agent or you go to a broker and he gets it for you. You have no contact with the insurance company as distinct from life insurance. I doubt if there is a member of this assembly —he can, on the one hand, always tell what life insurance company carries his life insurance, but I defy any member of the assembly to tell me who carries his general fire policy!

Mr. Shulman: The Royal!

Mr. Renwick: He will know the name of his agent but not, on very many occasions, will he know—the member for High Park obviously is an exception in the case. He must have had a recent claim! But most people do not know the name of the insurance company which provides their automobile, fire and other general insurance company. They know the name of their insurance agent.

Let's not have the insurance companies in the general insurance field hiding behind the front which is provided for them by the controlled agency business of the province by providing an even higher degree of protection; unless the minister can say to us:

"This is one of a series of progressive steps by which we are going to subject to review in the Province of Ontario the rate-fixing basis for establishing premiums in the general insurance field which affect every citizen."

When we get that kind of a statement one can, with a bit of enthusiasm, support this kind of provision.

We are all in our little in-game tonight. You know, playing this little game out. It's very important in a very limited, marginal field that the minister recognizes that 50 per cent is no good, that 25 per cent is slightly better. It's not nearly as good as some intelligent explanation of a degree of Canadian ownership, which is used in the federal income tax and elsewhere, for more sophisticated methods of determining control. Let's play that little game out. But I ask the minister tonight, in what conceivable way is this amendment to the Insurance Act going to reduce the insurance premium in the general insurance field for any person in the Province of Ontario?

And that's the rationale and the test that has got to be used. Because the insurance business, par excellence, is an international business and operates in the international market. And I'm just afraid that if we provide protection for the brokerage industry and the insurance agency business, we will not have even the limited benefit available today of the international market for the purpose of getting insurance at the lowest possible rates.

So I say to the minister, where did the impetus come for this amendment in the first

place? And secondly, in what way will it reduce the premiums that any citizen in Ontario pays for his general insurance coverage?

Mr. Shulman: If you are hoping for answers you will be gravely mistaken.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, as you suggested, I don't think that too much of the discussion was apropos of the amendment. But I want to say this, that a few evenings ago — and of course as the hon. member for Riverdale speaks on, sometimes it is difficult for me to follow him completely and totally—the other evening he was supporting the competition of the foreign companies on the Ontario scene. And I am not suggesting that he was absolutely correct, but in some discussion that has taken place here this evening, we were talking about the insurers when in fact the amendment is totally speaking about agents, brokers and adjusters.

Mr. Renwick: Precisely, agents, brokers and adjusters.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And the purpose, of course, is to conserve the Canadian participation, and allow it to develop. Also to prohibit to this particular degree, non-resident takeovers, even though there is sufficient scope within—which I think should satisfy the member for Riverdale—for some expansion for existing companies if they are non-resident up to the degree specified in the Act. I am not going to say that this, in regard to foreign control, is the be-all and the end-all of things—

Mr. Shulman: No-all!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not at all. Not at all.

Mr. Shulman: Know nothing.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But it is a beginning.

Mr. Shulman: It is not even a beginning.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not in your view, not in your view!

Mr. Shulman: Not in any sense!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There is an amendment in front of us and if you feel that way you support the amendment. That is the way it will be, and that is the way you will resolve the question.

Mr. Deacon: Just one moment.

It is a shame. It is a real pity. It is regretted by all of us that tonight we are hearing for the second time in this Act where the minister has said to us: "It may not be the end. We are going to do something better perhaps later on. But this is far as we go now"—without any explanation.

In section 8, the minister did the very same thing. He came in with the most illogical amendment that he couldn't explain, he refused to give us any explanations, and said: "I rest my case." He rests his case on nothing.

Mr. Shulman: He rests his case on ignorance.

Mr. Deacon: And it is for this reason we shall have a vote on this tonight, because this is too important a point for the minister to leave and say: "This isn't the be-all and the end-all. We'll maybe think about it later on." He could do it right now and he should.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. Shulman: He has given no reason not to.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the minister that if I spoke at too great length for him I want to summarize what I said to him.

Mr. Chairman: Well we don't — order! Order please! We have it repeated several times.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The minister wants it clarified.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I assure you I am not going to carry on the debate beyond this. I want to say to the minister very clearly that in my judgement the clause which we are about to pass, and we will pass it because of the majority that the government has, whether it is 25 per cent or 50 per cent will not affect one iota the premium level in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! This is very repetitious. Order please! This is very repetitious. The hon. member must realize that.

Mr. Renwick: I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that you got the drift of my remarks, because the minister answered my remarks by saying he didn't understand them. Perhaps if you would switch places with the minister we could shorten the time of the House and the debate.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Renwick: I think it is most important, Mr. Minister, that you understand that you cannot fool the public in the Province of Ontario by protecting one small segment of the insurance business. It is essential, in my view, that you come in with a rationale to effectively require public disclosure of the basis on which rates of the general insurance business are established in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the minister. Can the minister give us any reason whatsoever why he refuses to accept this amendment? He keeps saying "We are starting, we are starting." He hasn't given any reason whatsoever why this amendment shouldn't be accepted. Is there any reason? Is it just stubbornness? Did he get up with a backache?

Mr. Chairman: The question is repetitious and the minister has answered.

Mr. Shulman: He hasn't answered. He has given no answer. I asked will he give any reason, but I guess we must say he rests his case.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Those in favour of Mr. Deacon's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order! We outnumber them. You can't count. You have deliberately misled everyone here. We have 15 members and they have only 12.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Can't you count?

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Order please!

Mr. Shulman: You can't count. We won that vote. You know we won it!

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The hon. member must know the chairman doesn't have to count.

Mr. Shulman: He cannot listen either. He has no eyes, he has no ears, he has no sense.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Who are you putting on a show for, Morty?

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Deacon had moved that the words "the majority of" in the third line of subsection 2(a) of section 14, be deleted and the words "in excess of 25 per cent of" be substituted therefor.

Those in favour of Mr. Deacon's motion will please rise.

Those opposed will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 28, the nays 45.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost, and section 14 carried.

Section 14 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments—I am sorry?

Mr. Shulman: I hope we will have more impartiality from the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Well the rules were carried out very explicitly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I will be heard on this point of order, if I may.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Does the member have a point of order?

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order. My point of order is we expect impartiality from the Chair when there is a majority—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: May I complete my point of order?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: When there is a majority on this side of the House that votes one way, and the government votes the other, we expect you to be impartial. There was an obvious majority on this side. It is not enough for you to ignore the majority. In the future it will be the same. And it doesn't matter how much—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

May I point out to the hon. member something I shouldn't have to point out. The chairman is not called upon to count the people here. He cannot assume which way the people will vote in any party. So we can only go by the voice, and the voice was as evenly split as possible. And I am sitting in the middle of it, right here. That is right.

Mr. Shulman: You have made my point. If the voices were evenly split how did you come to the decision that the amendment had not carried?

Mr. Chairman: There is a very well established rule in all rules of parliamentary procedure that the chairman is entitled to rule in the direction in which the anticipated vote will go; or is anticipated to go. This is very firmly established.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): He is an embarrassment to your party and you want to bail him out.

Mr. MacDonald: I want to quietly—

Mr. Chairman: Order please, hon. members!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You are so split over there, and now you are trying to bail him out. It is pathetic.

Mr. Cassidy: That is pretty phoney indignation!

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Does the hon. member have a point of order?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Why don't you kick the minister out?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am here voting.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Not very intelligently.

Mr. Chairman: Order please, to hear the member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to quietly make a point. There was one chairman—I have forgotten now who it was—about four or five years ago, who created quite a precedent in this House.

An hon. member: Reuter.

Mr. MacDonald: It was Mr. Reuter, the present Speaker. When it was obvious in a vote—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: When it was obvious in a vote that the government had lost the chairman then called it as it really was. And the only result then is, Mr. Chairman, that the government, rather than the opposition, must call for a recorded vote.

Mr. Lewis: But you don't have five people to stand up at any given time.

Mr. MacDonald: I assume you had five members here?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a further point of order—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The chairman very fairly ruled according to the sound of the voice at this table a few moments ago. The numbers, apparently, somebody told me afterwards, were about even. I ruled the way I heard it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member is out of order! The member is out of order!

Mr. Lewis: You know, you're going to expire tonight. We'll have another by-election in Middlesex South!

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): You would be so lucky.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Get hold of yourself. Get hold of yourself there! You're going to have apoplexy.

Mr. Shulman: It is strange that a government with 78 members, cannot keep a dozen in the House.

Mr. Chairman: That's not a point of order. Any other comments, questions, or amendments—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Any other comments, questions, or amendments in any other section up to and including section 18?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I want to talk about section 17, if I may for a moment—

Mr. Chairman: Anything before 17? Then carry on.

Mr. Singer: Technically, perhaps, I'm a bit out of order. It's a matter I raised on second reading. The minister is aware of it and it deals, really, not with schedule C, but it deals with schedule E of the Act.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): There they go; there they go.

An hon. member: There's a committee sitting.

Mr. Shulman: If McKeough goes things will be quieter around here!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: As soon as they're quieter, Mr. Chairman, I'll try to proceed. We'll pause until they leave; or are they going?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, schedule E of the Act, as inserted by the Insurance Act Amendment Act, chapter 84, of 1971, specified amongst other things that insofar as notice of a claim is concerned, "written notice should be given within 30 days of the accident, by registered mail to the head office of the company, and that proof of the medical details be given within 90 days from the date of the accident."

It was quickly ascertained that those strict limitation periods were a very substantial difficulty placed in the face of potential claimants. And as there was power within the regulations, an amending regulation was passed, amending both sub (a) and sub (b) of section 3 of that schedule E, adding words to the effect "within 30 days, or as close as may be reasonable"—and I haven't got the exact wording—and within 90 days or as may be reasonable."

Unfortunately, that kind of an amendment, which is an important one, is not found in the printed statutes. It's found in the regulations. My plea to the minister is a very simple one; to help potential claimants and to help members of the legal profession who may not be familiar with that kind of mechanical procedure and whose authority would be merely the picking up of the latest section of the Act and saying: "Well, 30 days is the time. We're beyond the 30-day limit. I'm sorry, Mr. Potential Claimant, you're out of time. We can't make a claim." The ramifications that flow from that are very serious. Now this is not suggesting that the government change anything that it wasn't their intention to do, and in fact that they haven't already done in their regulations.

My plea to the minister is very simple, that at this point in time, tonight as we're putting through amendments to the Insurance Act, he incorporate into this section 3, (a) and (b), the words that the Lieutenant Governor in Council has already inserted by means of regulations. And I may say, Mr. Chairman, it's a most unusual procedure that the wording of a statute can be amended by an order in council. In fact, I know of no other instance where that power is available. I'm not suggesting the power isn't a legal power, but it isn't something that a legal practitioner is going to anticipate can be done. In fact, where the statute is specific, this is the only case that I know of, where by a reason of peculiar wording—and I don't know how it ever got in there or why it's ever been continued—an amendment can be made to a provision in the statute, by regulation.

What I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is this; it makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the ordinary legal practitioner to properly advise his clients as to what the law is. I am not particularly worried about the lawyers, but I am worried about the people they are advising. Because an ordinary cautious lawyer—and the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Clement) got into this earlier and agreed with me—the ordinary cautious lawyer who does his best to properly advise his clients, when faced with this kind of a problem is going to pick up the last statute book, which would be the statutes of 1971, volume 2, and say: "Well, that's the law. There it is. It is in the book." And it really isn't going to occur to him to go back to the revised statutes to trace down the regulatory power and to discover, by some very unusual procedure, that a section of the statute, the schedule in this case, can be amended by regulation.

So I would say it is a very simple procedure tonight to introduce a very brief amendment in the words of the regulation, changing what is in the statute.

Now the minister said to me earlier that he is advised that the problem is all going to be cleared up when an office consolidation is printed. But that's not good enough. Because the minister is not a lawyer and doesn't know how these things happen. I sit in my office and the client comes in and asks for advice about this particular thing, and I can't carry all the statutes around in my mind. I reach for the statute book and

I turn to page 686 dealing with the schedule and I see the time limit is 30 days. There are no saving words in it and I am duty bound to say to the client: "I am sorry. You are out of time. You came to me too late, and there is nothing I can do to help you."

Now, if I was dealing with it every day, or if I had 100 lawyers in my office, and one of them only did this kind of work, probably he would be aware of it, and would know that he had to go to the regulations. But I say that if the minister allows this to continue in the way it is, he is doing a very great disservice to people who are asking for advice from the legal profession and getting it in all good conscience. Because the ordinary lawyer who is in practice is not going to know about this unless he has come in contact with it.

I am not asking the minister to change government policy. I am merely asking him to say in one place what the statute and the regulations together say—say it in the statutes because that's the way you did it first. And if the minister wants, I can draft the amendment, I would rather he did, but it is a very simple amendment and it is already enunciated in government policy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member has pointed out, I am not a lawyer. But I consulted with a lawyer in my department, and he assured me that with the reprint of the Act as of December, I believe it is—the amendments that were made will be clear for the hon. member and will be in the Act itself.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect, that's not enough. Because this Act became effective on the date it was proclaimed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, which was last July 28. I don't know when the reprint is going to come out, or the office consolidation. And if the minister has a copy of an office consolidation then he will note there's a note on it: "This is only an office consolidation and is not authoritative. It should only be used for purposes of consultation and if you really want the authority, go to the statutes."

So the ordinary lawyer, if he has been able to get a copy of the consolidation—he is not going to be able to get it for several months, I gather, from the minister's own remarks—if he is in any doubt, is going to go to the statute, which is the authority. This book is issued with the authority of this assembly, and this is where we look. And if there is any doubt, the office consolidation is only a second authority.

So I urge upon the minister a very simple thing. I am not asking him to do anything unusual. I am not asking him to depart from government policy. I am asking him to provide a service for people whose responsibilty it is to advise potential claimants in a manner in which the government has already decided they should be advised. And that—

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is away beyond rationality tonight.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I think it is a very simple thing. I invite the hon. member for Niagara Falls, who joined in this debate at an earlier stage, to join with me tonight in urging this reasonable procedure by the minister.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. J. T. Clement (Niagara Falls): If my grandfather in his grave heard me standing here tonight they would probably refer to him as a pinwheel.

I never thought, Mr. Chairman, that I would find myself inclined to agree with my learned friend from Downsview. But I must share his views. There is a problem that perhaps is not appreciated by people who are not practising law in the House, and I am not saying that in any supercilious fashion. But there is a very definite problem met by people attempting to advise their clients, when they refer to the statute and do find that it has been amended by regulation. I am no legislative draftsman, nor do I profess to be, but I submit with the greatest respect that the principle can be a very dangerous one, and I can assure the minister, if he will take my word if not that of the learned member for Downsview, that I can see no harm in it.

I hope that is what the member wanted.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Since there is such a very great degree of agreement I think I can accede to the desires, and as soon as I have an amendment prepared I will present it if you will allow us to go on with the balance.

Mr. Chairman: We will hold section 17 in abeyance then until the end.

Anything on section 18? The hon. Leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for Downsview?

The hon. member for Donwsview.

Mr. Singer: I'd like to talk on section 18, Mr. Chairman.

Here we get into a different kind of a thing. Section 18 as amended, according to the marginal note, "confirms the original intention that mandatory automobile benefits enacted in 1971 take effect for all contracts on and after the 1st day of January, 1972."

Now that marginal note by itself is reasonably simple and reasonably clear, until you go back to the section that is being amended. And I defy anyone, Mr. Chairman, to read section 27 of the Insurance Amendment Act, 1971, and come to the conclusion that what was intended in that section was that this Act become effective on Jan. 1, 1972. Let me read you, Mr. Chairman, section 27 of the Insurance Amendment Act, 1971. It says this:

> Sections 14 and 15 apply to all contracts evidenced by motor vehicle liability policies made or renewed on or after the 1st day of January, 1972—

up to that point it is clear enough:

> —and all contracts evidenced by motor vehicle liability policies made or renewed before and subsisting when this Act receives royal assent.

Mr. Chairman, pause with me, if you will, and consider those last words: "and all contracts evidenced by motor vehicle liability policies made or renewed before and subsisting when this Act receives royal assent."

Now this Act received royal assent on July 28, 1971. So I think the simple English interpretation is that this must apply to all contracts that were in existence on July 28, 1971. Therefore, I ask the minister how the explanatory note in this new section can possibly make any sense, because those words in their clear English meaning, at least as I read them and understand them, mean that section was supposed to apply to all contracts in existence on July 28, 1971.

Subsection (d) goes on to say, "or made or renewed after this Act receives royal assent and before the 1st day of January, 1972"—perhaps that even bolsters my argument—"shall be deemed to contain the benefits, limits and terms and conditions set forth in Schedule A."

What does all that mean? It means, Mr. Chairman, that we have to determine the effective date on which the no-fault provisions became compulsory. Did they in fact become compulsory, as one would normally conclude, on the day this Act received royal assent, which was July 28, 1971? Or was there some real intention, which escaped me frankly as I read and reread this section 27 of the old Act, that it only become effective on Jan. 1? Is there a difference? Yes, there is a very big difference.

I don't know how many accidents took place between July 28, 1971, and Jan. 1, 1972. I know of at least one case and that happens to be in my office. That accident took place on Dec. 5. After having shilly-shallied about it for several months, the insurance company has said, "We are now satisfied that we are no longer bound by the no-fault provision; we weren't sure before. There was a great legal argument going on. We are not bound by no-fault provisions unless the accident took place after Jan. 1."

In essence, Mr. Chairman, I think the government, having walked into the last election, saying: "Look what great fellows we are. We now have compulsory no-fault. Look at our new statute; look at the Insurance Act; look what section 27 says, as of the date of the royal assent to this bill, chapter 84, no-fault is effective. As of that day, July 28, you are all covered."

For some reason that I don't understand, the government has now chosen to interpret differently what I understand was the original reading of the section.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that section 18, as it is now written, should not in fact be passed if there is any doubt in the minds of lawyers or draftsmen as to what the real meaning of 27 was—and there is no doubt in my mind. Perhaps that should be amended as well. But, at least, Mr. Chairman, section 18 as it presently is before us should not be allowed to stand. I think it does a grave injustice to the group of people who thought, and had every reason to believe, that they were covered by compulsory no-fault provision, as and from July 28 up to Jan. 1.

That's what you said in the election campaign; that's what you said in your statute and that's the way it should be. To put explanatory words in that for the sake of clarification it now is going to apply only as of Jan. 1, I think begs the issue. I don't know why the government suddenly felt it had to make this decision in favour of the insurance company and against claimants, because if there was any doubt involved—and I am not prepared to admit that—but in the event there was any doubt involved, surely this government, which claims it's the champion of the citizen and not of the big companies, should have resolved that doubt in favour of

the people who might make a claim under the compulsory no-fault provision?

So I urge upon the minister, who is being eminently reasonable tonight, that he have another look at this amendment and withdraw section 18 as it presently stands before us, and if he still has any doubt, or his advisers still have any doubt about the original meaning of section 27, clear up the wording of that one a little bit by another amendment, so that there's no doubt that the provisions of 27 became effective on the day the statute received royal assent on July 28, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: First, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I am informed that the amendment requested by the hon. members for Downsview and Niagara Falls affects five separate situations through the schedule. I am asking them if it would be possible that they would allow me to insert these amendments by regulation?

Mr. Singer: We are reverting back to 17 now.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes. And leave it to the legislative counsel to implement the situation that you've made reference to; it will be in the reprint of the bill for third reading.

Mr. Singer: Well that's fine. The words, so that I can properly understand, will be something to the effect, within the 30 days or 90 days or whatever time may be reasonable thereafter; and similar words to the ones that have already been used in the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes; fine!

Mr. Singer: Yes, well, then I am content with that.

Mr. Chairman: Is that acceptable to the committee? Carried!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now if the hon. member would permit me to proceed, I think that I have two amendments to produce in section 19 that will satisfy him with regard to the arguments that he has put forward.

Mr. Singer: Section 18.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: My amendments will come on 19.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps you should read the amendments so the hon. member will know what they're about.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I can do that. The amendment to clause 19 is that section (1) of 19 of the bill be amended by deleting "and 12" in the first line and substituting therefore "12 and 18."

Mr. Singer: Could the minister explain? I'm a little slow on grasping the deep significance of that. What are you achieving by that? You may be achieving what I have asked for.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the second part of the amendment would be—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Just a minute now—the second amendment is that the said section 19 be amended by adding thereto the following subsection (3): "That section 18 shall be deemed to have come into force on the 28th day of July, 1971."

Mr. Singer: In case there is still any doubt in my sceptical mind, am I clear in my understanding—and I have only quickly read this and listened to the minister—that as of July 28, 1971, anyone who was injured in an accident could claim under compulsory no-fault provisions of insurance policies?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is my understanding that this will justify any claims that have been made as of July 21, 1971. It obliterates, in other words, the old 27 under Bill 81.

Mr. Singer: Yes, all right. Let's deal with my man who was involved in a motor accident on Dec. 5 and the manner in which I understood the law was written until I saw the minister's amendment. I wrote to the insurance company saying: "I hereby make claim on behalf of my client." They wrote back to me two months later and said: "We are sorry. We now say that the compulsory no-fault doesn't start until Jan. 1." Is he now about to be reinstated?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is my humble opinion that, first of all, on the matter that is brought forward by the hon. member for Downsview and the hon. member for Niagara Falls, the implementation of this particular amendment would cover that situation.

Mr. Singer: I hope you are right, and I don't know how quickly I can look into all—

Mr. Chairman: In view of what we have learned about section 19, shall section 18 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Singer: Could I say to the minister that I hope his interpretation, as I now understand it, is right; because there are going to be multi-copies of this debate go

to all the insurance companies. I would hope and I would think—and we will perhaps have a look at it between now and third reading—that what this means is that as of July 28 we had compulsory no-fault in Ontario. Is that right?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Nothing else it could mean but that.

Mr. Singer: If it doesn't mean that, could the minister please tell us?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You are just as aware as I am of the situation that has developed as a result of the bill that was in existence. It was certainly not of my manufacture.

Mr. Singer: It was confusing.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I might say that—yes, possibly confusing—but as I read it I could discern rather clearly that Jan. 1 was the date that was referred to—on Jan. 1, 1972. It was made confusing by others who placed interpretations on it. As I say to you, in my humble opinion, the legislation will clarify everything that was under claim that was made at the particular time of the accident, or was within the provisions of what the bill will suggest. I would think it will cover the situation that my hon. friend has referred to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Or that might be claimed subsequent to this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I can't talk about "might be" claims.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we are being saved by the clock. As this has a very technical and important meaning, I wonder if you would care to call it 10:30 without our having passed on the minister's suggestions, and perhaps give a few of us a few hours to think this over until the bill is called again? I think this, and the use of words in this, is of sufficient importance. I am not suggesting the minister is trying to mislead or anything else; I want to satisfy myself, at least, as to what I think is the full significance of the amendment. It being this hour, perhaps the chairman could call it 10:30 of the clock and we could come on to it at a later time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I hadn't looked at the clock, but I think that is a fair idea. I will move that the committee rise and report.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn the House I would like to say that I will reserve the right to proceed with the bill in regard to pyramid selling on Thursday, followed by estimates as scheduled; Natural Resources first, followed by Health.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 16, 1972

Children's Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2525

Insurance Act, bill to amend, in committee 2526

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2549

No. 65



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, May 18, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors with us today. In the east gallery, students from St. Clair Junior High School of Don Mills and Centennial Secondary School of Windsor. In the west gallery, students from Collingwood Collegiate and Vocation School of Collingwood.

Statements by the ministry.

SALE OF ONTARIO TOBACCO TO CHINA

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the members of the Legislature will be anxious to share with me the pleasant experience of extending congratulations to the Ontario tobacco industry on closing a substantial sales agreement with the People's Republic of China. I have been in conversation with the chairman of the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board, Mr. George Demeyere, and he confirms that the industry has been able to negotiate a sale of Ontario tobacco to China which will yield some three-quarters of a million dollars. This is the first time that Ontario has been able to make such a sale, and we are confident it is only the beginning of a long series of sales agreements.

In making this statement, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that the credit for this achievement deservedly goes to the spokesmen for the industry. Last November, Mr. Demeyere and four members of his board, Mr. Peter Newell, Mr. Stanley Smith, Mr. Ernest Duckett and Mr. Remie Miggens, travelled to the Republic of China to attend the Kwang Chow fair where samples of Ontario tobacco were on display through the combined efforts of the Flue-Cured Tobacco Board and the Canadian tobacco processing companies. That tobacco trade mission, and the energetic follow-up by the tobacco industry, has resulted in the sale which was confirmed this morning.

I would also like the members of this Legislature to know through you, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario tobacco industry has an outstanding record in export sales and sales promotion. In each of the last two years, approximately 40 per cent of the crop went into the export market. This involved exports to some 40 different countries and yielded approximately $80 million last year, an all-time record. The beneficial effects of these sales to Ontario and to Canada are very far-reaching.

Mr. Demeyere, the chairman of the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board, and Mr. Peter Newell, chairman of the board's export promotion committee are in the Speaker's gallery today and as Minister of Agriculture and Food, on behalf of the members of the Legislature, I want to extend congratulations to them and wish them continued success.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Does the minister think we could sell any to Cuba?

EXTENSION OF EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAMME

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague, the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), I am pleased to announce that in response to a number of requests from participating municipalities, school boards, Indian bands and conservation authorities, the government of Ontario is extending the 1971-1972 provincial-municipal employment incentive programme beyond the original expiry date of May 31, 1972. Projects under this programme may be continued up to and including June 17. An unusually cold spring has caused delays—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and this extension of time will permit the participants to make full use of the funds allocated to them and at the same time provide work for persons who might otherwise be unemployed.

Mr. Lewis: Boy, did you strike me down! I can understand why the Treasurer wasn't here to make the announcement.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): He's in regional Niagara looking after the people over there.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Who is that fellow standing up there? Who is that?

REPORT ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of interest shown throughout the country on the tabling of the royal commission report on the non-medical use of drugs. I want to take this opportunity to announce that the response of this government to the reports and, indeed, to the recommendations of the LeDain commission, as it is referred to, will be developed through the cabinet committee on social development in consultation, of course, with my colleagues in the policy field of justice.

It is quite clear that the amount of work that has been done by this commission, and indeed the scope of its recommendations, precludes any instant or superficial response. The development of policy regarding drug use in general and marijuana in particular is a matter that cuts across the concern of many ministries of this government.

The changing social policy in relation to the use of drugs by any group, Mr. Speaker, as will be appreciated by members of the House, is an irrevocable step and should not be made without exhaustive studies of its implications. In this respect, we must be very grateful for the LeDain commission's work and its report, in that we now have been provided with a very large body of information and, of course, the opinions of the commissioners. It is now our duty and, indeed, our responsibility to assess this; and only after such a careful assessment will we in the government then be prepared to respond and to act.

GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the House today that during the past month-and-a-half, the Ministry of Education has been in the process of evaluating 157 submissions to the Grants-in-aid of Educational Research programme for 1972-1973.

An independent committee of nine members, chaired by Dean H. H. Nesbitt of Carleton University, has made its recommendations to me, and I am pleased to inform the House today that we have awarded 35 grants for research relevant to the problems of our elementary and secondary education.

A total of $387,422 has been allocated, with $210,652 awarded to nine provincially supported universities; $46,270 to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education; and $130,500 to seven of this province's publicly supported school boards.

The projects which have been funded under the grants-in-aid programme were carefully screened with special attention given to their relevance to the needs of education today. There were seven awards made to projects concerned with school organization and related alternatives. These included studies of the open-plan school and other innovations.

Teacher education was the focus of two of the successful submissions and there were eight dealing specifically with various matters pertinent to curriculum. Reading and language learning, as well as projects examining the process of learning itself were also granted funding. Areas which require special attention, including studies of foreign-born students, deaf and retarded children, and the whole field of early childhood education accounted for nine of the 35 successful proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the wide range of topics covered is very encouraging to me and to the Ministry of Education, as is the very high calibre of the researchers who have been funded. A major effort of the grants-in-aid programme is to support research which can have practical application throughout the province; and we are convinced that the 35 proposals which have been accepted for this year and which we are supporting, will do this.

SULPHUR DIOXIDE CONTROL PROGRAMME

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a statement on the ministry's control programmes for emitters of sulphur dioxide.

The hon. members are, of course, aware that a regulation, No. 17 of 1970, restricts the permissible sulphur content of fossil fuels used in Metropolitan Toronto. The current maximum permissible level is 1¾ per cent sulphur in coal and some types of oil.

Next year this maximum will be reduced to 1½ per cent.

Air quality monitoring in Metropolitan Toronto over the past few years shows us the ambient sulphur dioxide levels have fallen from one part per 10 million parts of air to one-half that amount. Control programmes for a number of large sources of sulphur dioxide contamination have produced a marked improvement through the last months of 1971.

This recent improvement and further control programmes lead me to believe that sulphur dioxide levels will continue to drop in Metropolitan Toronto. As a result, we do not feel at the moment that it is necessary to lower the sulphur content of fuels beyond those levels specified in the regulation for 1973.

Instead, I intend to confine the attention of the air quality branch to the larger sources of sulphur dioxide, which are generally more significant in achieving our desired goal of a maximum annual average of two parts per 100 million. This policy, of course, will be reviewed as more data become available on its effectiveness.

Our study of Metropolitan Toronto with an air pollution simulation model indicates that these large sources of sulphur dioxide have a major effect on air quality, but that regulations controlling fuel for these and the many low-level sources have contributed to the general improvement.

We have not felt, to date, that restrictions are needed on the sulphur content of fuels in areas outside Toronto, although this measure does remain open to us. In cities like London, for example, levels of this type of contamination are close to our objectives. In other centres, like Sudbury, our goals can be met by taking on the large sources individually with control programmes tailored to their specific operations.

This sort of approach to sulphur dioxide control has proved its effectiveness in Toronto. The Richard L. Hearn generating station reduced its output of this gas by switching to natural gas for a large part of its operation and going to a 700-ft. stack. So did Toronto General Hospital, changing to natural gas and operating a new 450-ft. stack.

The Lakeview generating station, just west of the city, is now on a programme of abatement which will come into effect in 1974.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say we are satisfied with the results these programmes have achieved and we fully expect that continuing abatement will allow us to meet our objectives.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

REPORT ON NON-MEDICAL USE OF DRUGS

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, further to his statement: Does the announcement of the review by the cabinet of policy pertaining to the recommendations of the LeDain report preclude the Addiction Research Foundation from issuing an independent view as they have done in the past when the LeDain commission made its interim reports?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the Addiction Research Foundation personnel will be very much involved in the consideration of this matter. There will be a technical committee to advise the social development policy field committee, of which the Addiction Research Foundation people will be a very important part.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Does that mean there will be no pronouncement from ARF pending the statement from the cabinet review commitee?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Could the minister advise the House of the position of the government with regard to people who have been convicted for marijuana and are now serving time?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would have no comment to make on this. What we have before us at the moment is the report of a commission studying the non-medical use of drugs which makes some recommendations with respect to sentences and enforcement. What the ultimate law of Canada will be in that regard remains to be seen with respect to the response of the government of Canada; so I really think the question of the hon. member is premature.

EXTENSION OF EMPLOYMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAMME

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Revenue, following his statement: Does the additional 17 days' grace granted by the government for the completion of

winter works projects under the provincial programme carry with it any additional funding for any specific programmes or the possibility of expanding some of the programmes that are presently in operation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that the funds available are sufficient for the purposes sought by the municipalities, I am also advised that a further extension may be granted with respect to projects which involve community service to elderly persons and pensioners. This may be extended to Sept. 15 under certain circumstances.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But, by way of supplementary, there will be no additional funds for projects of any type? This is simply a grace period to use up the funds that have already been allocated?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the minister advise whether, even by June 17 it is anticipated that all the allocated funds will be used?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can't answer that specifically, Mr. Speaker. All I can tell the hon. member is that it is felt that this will do the job, by and large. Most of the municipalities which have asked for an extension will be able to carry out their projects by then.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, could the minister advise how he comes to the interesting figure of a 17-day extension? Why wouldn't it have been 21 days or 30 days or 90 days? What is the rationale behind that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The rationale, in the first place, is that the federal government has agreed to go along to the 15th. It is felt that, at some stage or other, we have to make sure that the time limit that is set will eventually be understood as being that time limit. In view of the special circumstances this year, it is felt that we could extend it and should extend it to this period of time and, as I have previously stated, it is felt this will do the job that it is necessary to do.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary on this, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Has the government tabulated or estimated the numbers of unemployed, as of June 18, in the programmes which cease on June 17?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that information, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you.

WCB RETIREMENTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Labour: Can he report to the House as to the reasons for the termination of five senior officials with the Workmen's Compensation Board and if, in fact, the rather generous provisions that have prevailed recently with the Workmen's Compensation Board for people taking retirement early or otherwise are going to be applied, in spite of the fact that these provisions have come under public criticism?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker. I saw the story in the Globe and Mail this morning. I have been trying to get in touch with the chairman of the board. Apparently, he has also been trying to contact me, but I haven't had any communication from the board so far. As for the second part of this question, I think this matter is being studied or reviewed and looked into by the resources development committee and the Minister of Labour would expect some recommendations from the committee.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: No matter what those recommendations are, wouldn't it be true to say that the minister could not permit the practices that have gone on in the past to be repeated in the future?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I would think the hon. Leader of the Opposition is right in his assumption.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: With respect, by way of supplementary, then, if these people were retired, as indicated in the story, on the basis of the existing early retirement benefit plan at the board, the minister will rescind retroactively those provisions of the plan, by which they felt they were covered, and apply the civil service scale?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, Mr. Speaker, really I am not in a position to tell exactly what the minister can do at this stage, at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

OHC PURCHASE OF HYDRO LAND

Mr. Lewis: Yes, a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Revenue about housing: Can the minister inform the Legislature the state of current negotiations between the Ontario Housing Corp. and Ontario Hydro and the effort of OHC to purchase that land which was originally intended for a transmission line for Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There was a meeting this morning, Mr. Speaker, between the officials of the two agencies. The only reason for the delay is negotiation as to the price that should be paid. I expect this to be resolved very shortly.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Since both of these agencies are in the public sector —they are both Crown agencies as it were— can the minister indicate to us what the price problems are and what are the negotiated prices being discussed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In view of the fact they are negotiating, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I should be at liberty—indeed I couldn't —to tell the hon. member precisely the amounts being talked about at this present time. The Ontario Housing Corp. is limited in certain respects because it deals with the funds of two governments—CMHC and OHC, the agencies of the two governments. Therefore, they are to some extent restricted in what they can do by way of buying land and so on. Suffice it to say that they feel it is their job to pay the market value and this is the discussion at the present market value of the property.

Mr. Lewis: Am I right in thinking that at least 42 large houses in downtown Toronto have been empty for more than a year now with two public agencies vying over their use while 8,000 families look for large-size homes in the Metropolitan area?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is wrong. There haven't been 42 houses vacant for over a year. Indeed, most of the houses were occupied the last time I saw them, which was a few weeks ago. I think the newspaper story which said that they all had been vacated, is incorrect. I say that with qualification because I haven't gone down to see myself, but as of a few weeks ago most of them were still occupied. I rather imagine many of them still are.

I should point out to the hon. member that it was precisely the fact that some of the occupants of those houses had been evicted because of the actions of Hydro in attempting to put a transformer station within the area that somewhat incensed me at the time and caused me to take an interest in the matter and caused the government to ask them to cease and desist from this plan that they had. To whether the houses are occupied in total, I know they are not, because they weren't when they came to my attention about a year ago; in fact, over a year ago. I think most of them still are. I will make it a point to find out how many are vacant today and advise the member.

Mr. Lewis: What conceivable justification can there be for any number of houses in the public sector remaining vacant with the minister's cumulative waiting list? How does that happen?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must keep in mind that some of those houses have, in fact, been condemned. For a government agency or the government itself to place people in those houses would not be condoned, I'm sure. They have been vacant.

Some of them have been condemned. Even those which have not been condemned would require a lot of money to rehabilitate. I'm sure the hon. member wouldn't think it advisable to put many thousands of dollars into rehabilitating houses which in a very short period of time would be razed for whatever new project it was decided to put into effect.

Mr. Lewis: I have no idea. It's been almost three years now. A lot of people could be housed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, can the minister explain what position or what role Central Mortgage and Housing would play in this? I understand that in all arrangements with Central Mortgage and Housing, they are merely a lending agency and Ontario Housing Corp., in fact, decides the price at which any purchases or sales are made and seems to do so at prevailing market levels?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If, in fact, the project which will be decided upon for this area turns out to be one in which federal participation is involved, the federal government must agree to the price which is paid for land; must agree to the project, having regard particularly for the subsidization which may take place in that project.

Mr. Deacon: Has Central Mortgage ever turned down a loan to the Ontario Housing Corp. on the basis of the price of land?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can't specifically say, but I would say to the hon. member that I wouldn't be surprised if they have. I know there are one or two instances where the federal government has not agreed to a project presented by OHC. Whether or not it has to do with the cost of the land, is something I can't answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

LANGUAGES OF INSTRUCTION

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Education: Could the minister elaborate on his comments about his personal resistance to, or reservations about, the Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board establishing an experimental class or classes in the Italian language for recently arrived Italian children?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the comment that appeared in today's Star was the result of the language of instruction in this provterday, talking basically about the principle of the language of instruction in this province. I quoted to that reporter a section from the Schools Administration Act which states that there are two languages of instruction in this province, English and French, and it certainly is not the basic policy of this ministry or this government to deviate from that policy and do anything to encourage any other languages of instruction in our schools.

However, under that section there is provision to allow a kind of process whereby a teacher may use the native language of the student in her class, in order to better get that student to adjust to the language of instruction, which, in the case we are referring to in Toronto, is English. And if an experimental project is going on with that as its objective we would have no hesitation in approving it.

However, if experimental projects are being suggested that ultimately could lead to a request for languages other than English or French as official languages of instruction in this Province, we would have difficulty in approving them. In fact, the policy would be not to approve them.

I had not heard of the project that the reporter asked me about. I have since learned about it, and it is in fact a study that OISE is going to carry on with the Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board. That is now getting under way and it will involve just one class of 11- and 12-year-olds. As I understand it—I haven't had a chance to read the total breakdown of the study yet—it has as its objective, I hope, to help those students to be able to use English better as the language of instruction.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Quite the opposite.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well if it is quite the opposite, we wouldn't be in favour of it.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): If, in fact, the experiment proves successful, surely the department will agree to an expansion of the use of native tongues in elementary schools?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, this of course is a very basic policy matter. I think that it would be to the great detriment of those students to encourage them to use their native tongues for a long period of time through—

Mr. Lewis: Nobody is saying for a long period of time.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —elementary instruction, when, in fact, for their own benefit to society and their own benefit here in Toronto and Ontario, would be far better served adapting to the English language. We don't quarrel with using the native language if it is to help them catch up if they are lagging behind because of their facility with English, but if we are suggesting that we should move to many other languages as the official languages of instruction I think that that would be a wrong principle.

Mr. Bullbrook: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister not aware that the intention of the programme is because of the impact of the environment upon these children, it's to enable them to converse with their parents in their parents' native tongue? That's the purpose of it. And by way of second supplementary, does the department, as a matter of policy, find that abhorrent?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Question?

Mr. Bullbrook: That is two questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We certainly have no—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We certainly have no hesitation in encouraging children to be able to converse with their parents in their native tongue, and I suggest to the hon. member that that is not the problem here, because most of these students who were trying to bridge the gap are very capable in their own language. The problem is that they, perhaps because they have spoken for five years in their home in their native language to their parents, are having trouble catching up with their English friends in the school system, and what we are trying to do is bridge that gap for them.

As my hon. friend knows, there is adequate provision in the secondary school programme for credit courses in all kinds of languages where the language itself and the culture surrounding that language can be studied for a credit. We think that that is the proper way to handle this situation, but we just are not ready to say—

Mr. Bullbrook: That's the problem. The minister does not even know what the programmes are.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —that other languages of instruction should be used in this province.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right, one more.

Mr. Foulds: The thing that bothers me about—

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mr. Foulds: —the apparent attitude of the minister is, is it not a good teaching technique and would the department not approve of a good teaching technique if the programme works over a number of years—would the department not then approve of it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, of course, I am a little unclear as to what the hon. member means by "if this programme works over a number of years." If, as I suspect and hope, the programme really is to encourage and enable those Italian students to adjust over a year or two, they will adjust so that English, basically, can be the language of instruction that they will be at home with. Now, if the programme isn't to do that, I suggest—

Mr. Lewis: Why can't they be at home in a couple of languages, or three, or four?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —they can be at home in a couple of languages and learn them as a second, or a third, or a fourth language. What we are saying is that the languages of instruction, as we know them in our schools, are English and French and that's the basic principle. Now, if they want to be—

Mr. Lewis: Right, so in a couple of years you add another.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —multilingual, that's fine, but we're not moving to multilingual languages of instruction in this province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY BY ASSISTANT CROWN ATTORNEY

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice as a way of clarifying something: Is he aware that earlier this week the Ottawa Journal indicated that Mr. Del O'Brien is on retainer as assistant Crown attorney for Renfrew county and is also the provincial treasurer of the Progressive Conservative Party? Does he not think that that would constitute overt political activity?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Yes, there are two questions. The answer to question No. 1 is, yes, I am aware of those circumstances. Question No. 2, do I think that is overt political activity? Certainly, the answer to that is yes, as well. The problem, or the difficulty, if it is a problem or a difficulty, is that a part-time assistant Crown attorney is not covered by that section of the regulations and that is what Mr. Del O'Brien is; he is not a full-time assistant Crown attorney.

Mr. Lewis: Would not the minister say, as he examines the nuances and anomalies which emerge, that the position of Mr. Dick was really rather sorely compromised and that his firing, in the light of all the other

parallel cases, or nearly parallel cases, seems evermore illegitimate?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I gather by the hon. member's attempt to phrase a question in that manner that he is indicating that is his opinion—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, it's my opinion.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —that a Crown attorney should be able to engage in overt political activity. Is that right?

Mr. Lewis: The same way a defeated political candidate goes to the judiciary.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I disagree with the hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He's helping us with Dick and we are helping the member with the Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions? The hon. member for Kent.

SUGAR BEET INDUSTRY

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Is it true that a delegation of members from different farm organizations in southwestern Ontario met with him on the first of the week with regard to re-establishing the sugar beet industry in the Province of Ontario? If so, did he encourage this delegation or did he offer any assistance from his office in re-establishing the sugar beet industry in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to answer the hon. member in the affirmative. Yes, we did meet with the group from southwestern Ontario who have been former sugar beet growers and who are interested in re-establishing the industry.

I was most impressed with the logic of their presentation but their presentation hinges on the federal government's acceptance of their brief to the government of Canada, suggesting that Canada enter the international sugar agreements, that Canada become a member of the world organization. Now, if this is the case, then I think we can see stability placed in the sugar industry. It would create price stabilization throughout Canada. If that becomes a fact then, I think, it would mean further encouragement for the establishment of the industry in southwestern Ontario.

Two plants in western Canada, in Manitoba and Alberta, which are still carrying on, enjoy the freight rate protection from the St. Lawrence Seaway to those points in western Canada, where the beets are grown and they have that difference to add to their producers' income. We suggested to the group that we would be pleased to discuss it further and our department is exploring the areas which we were asked to explore by the group.

We were not asked by the group to provide a subsidy in any way to the industry. In fact, they don't want a subsidy; they want it to stand on its own feet. I give them full marks for that desire because, really, if it does stand on its own feet then it will have some hope of continuing, not being dependent on government subsidization or federal loans.

Mr. Spence: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

ALLEGATION MAN CHARGED UNDER FALSE NAME

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, Mr. Speaker. Is it the policy of his department to allow criminal charges to be laid under an assumed name so as to protect the reputation of certain individuals?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: First of all, I have no department as I think the hon. member should be aware. It would appear to me that a loaded question like that should be directed to the Attorney General.

Mr. Shulman: In that case, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to the Attorney General: How can the Attorney General explain the fact that with the full knowledge of his Crown attorney and the police officers, the serious charge of bank robbery was laid against the name of one, David Wilson, which was a pseudonym —with the knowledge of the police and the Crown attorney?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says "with the full knowledge" of my officials—I don't doubt that what he is telling us is the truth, as he knows it. I would like to just check into all of the facts before I make any comments.

Mr. Shulman: As a supplementary if I may: Is it the policy of the department to allow charges to be laid under a pseudonym under certain circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I am not aware of those circumstances but I will be glad to look into the whole situation. If the member has any extra information that he hasn't handed over, or advised us of at the moment, I would be glad to receive it.

Mr. Shulman: As a final supplementary: Are there any circumstances under which the minister would tolerate charges being laid under an assumed name?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Again, Mr. Speaker, until we look into the whole situation, I will make no further comments.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Revenue has the answer to questions asked previously.

USE OF ASSESSMENT COMPUTER TAPES

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) asked a series of questions directed to my colleague, the provincial Treasurer and myself, with regard to federal-provincial co-operation respecting a data bank. He was, I am sure, making reference to the National Revenue Real Estate Data Bank.

In April 1971, acting on a proposition from the Department of National Revenue, the Ontario Departments of Revenue and Municipal Affairs decided to respond positively to the federal government's request to co-operate in the establishment of a National Real Estate Data Bank. The purpose of the bank is to store and monitor all real estate transaction information around Valuation Day for taxation administration.

While the project is still in the pilot stage, Municipal Affairs and the Ontario Department of Revenue agreed to intergovernmental co-operation on this particular matter. We are anxious to aid the federal government in holding down public expenditure by reducing a duplication of effort and cost which would have to be borne by the taxpayers if the required resources were denied.

The federal government recognizes there will be certain costs in extracting the required information and has agreed to compensate the province accordingly. As the hon. member pointed out in his questions the executive-director of our municipal assessment branch, in a directive dated May 20, 1971, gave authorization to allow federal officials to make use of the province's facilities and to microfilm certain assessment records. The pilot project I referred to earlier has been confined to a single assessment region thus far in order to evaluate and assess the test run. It is known as the Halton-Peel feasibility study. The outcome will, in all probability, be used as a guideline in determining the future course of an agreement between the federal government and the provinces.

The hon. member also asked if any other province was participating in such a programme. I have been advised, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Saskatchewan is currently taking part in a similar test.

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Minister of Highways and Communications—Transportation and Communications. Before I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, I have a communication here, a telegram which says:

DELIGHTED TO READ THAT THE DRINKING MAN IN DRY GULCH CAN NOW WET HIS WHISTLE LEGALLY. STANLEY RANDALL.

That's a public apology on the part of the government!

Mr. Speaker: We will consider that a question.

TOBERMORY FERRY SERVICE

Mr. Sargent: A question of the minister: Does he have anything to report on the Manitoulin Island-Tobermory ferry setup?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communication): Mr. Speaker, I had what I consider a very fruitful meeting with the federal Minister of Transport about 2½ weeks ago. On the basis of that meeting, I then sent a letter to him at the end of that week and I am awaiting what I consider will be a favourable reply.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

INCO WORKING CONDITIONS

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Is the minister aware that for the last three days at the International Nickel Co. refinery in Copper Cliff, the temperatures on the floor where the men are

working have been exceeding well over 100 deg, and reached as high as 325 deg? And would the minister, now that he is aware of it, ensure that the International Nickel Co. provides proper ventilation?

Mr. Yakabuski: Tell them to stay out of the oven.

Mr. Laughren: The member thinks it is funny, does he?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the conditions as pointed out by the member; and certainly some information has been provided me by his colleagues. I'd have to check it out very, very carefully; and I intend to do so.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): What are you going to do about it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

METRO TORONTO INCINERATOR

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of the Environment: Since Metro council has just decided in favour of a traditional type for its new incinerator at the Commissioner St. plant, because it could not negotiate with Ontario Hydro for the sale of the surplus steam to the adjoining Hearn plant, will the minister intervene with Hydro to enable Metro to justify the installation of a modern incinerator—one which would convert the combustible garbage into steam and at the same time reduce the air pullution from the stack to a fraction of that from the traditional type of incinerator?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I expect to be discussing with Ontario Hydro a number of things in this field, and I'll certainly discuss that one at the same time.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary: In view of the urgency of the awarding of the new contract because of the minister's order about the shutdown of the Commissioner St. plant, will the minister undertake to contact Hydro immediately in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I'll do it as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

NATIVE POPULATION PARK LAND RIGHTS

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the minister prepared to intercede on behalf of native people living in the area of Puckasaw Park to ensure that their hunting and fishing and aboriginal rights will be protected before the province turns the land over to the federal government for the purposes of a national park?

Mr. Yakabuski: The member doesn't want the park?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, I believe during the estimates, I had planned to meet with the Hon. Jean Chretien and to meet with this particular group of Indians dealing with the Puckasaw question.

I have seen some of the demands and I understand that discussions have taken place at the federal level. I have not seen the results of those discussions, but I have intimated to Mr. Chretien that I would meet with him at a further date and possibly could jointly reach some agreement that would be acceptable to the federal government and, of course, to the Indians.

Mr. Stokes: Will the minister be discussing the aboriginal rights to hunt and fish in those areas before a land transfer is made?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh, yes. What we have done to date, Mr. Speaker, is only sign a letter of intent to further study the possibility of establishing a national park at Puckasaw. Certainly the requirements and the demands of the Indians would have to be met first.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

WINDSOR SENIOR CITIZENS' HOUSING

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. Is the minister aware that the waiting list for senior citizens' housing in the city of Windsor is over 1,500 and continues to rise monthly; and that the number of Ontario Housing Corp. accommodations for senior citizens is 636, according to the minister's own figures the other day; and only 732 units are in the planning stages, leaving a shortage of over 800 units? Will the min-

ister please consider expanding the rental supplement for the more than 1,541 senior citizens now needing accommodation that they can afford? That'll be the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will refer to the same question he asked me the other day and the answer I gave him; I think it was quite full. I gave him all the statistics. In fact, I pointed out that I was aware of whatever problem there is in Windsor in respect of senior citizens.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is aware of all the problems. Remember his half-billion-dollar housing policy a few years ago?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes; and it's doing very well.

Mr. Lewis: Five hundred million!

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Lewis: Where are they all?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Lewis: His famous Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has the floor.

Order!

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that his reply to me the other day simply made mention that he intended to extend family rental units, rather than senior citizen units; extending the rental supplement plan to the family rental units and not senior citizen units?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, our programme covers a wide range. We also have a problem in providing sufficient units for families, and where we do fill the gap in one area it provides housing for others as well. It takes up some of the slack. If the hon. member wants me to get up here and say we are satisfied that we'll look after all the housing problems in this province, he knows that he is mistaken, I won't say that. The Ontario Housing Corp. is working at a very rapid clip, and indeed has for the past 6½ years and has put up a tremendous amount of housing.

Mr. Lewis: About 68,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's right, 68,000, which will look after—

Mr. Lewis: The finest housing in the world!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which will look after about 200,000 people by the time these are finished.

Mr. Lewis: And yet you couldn't find a house for a family—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has a supplementary.

Mr. Lawlor: The thing is becoming a scandal.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister aware that at the rate his department is providing senior citizen housing units in the city of Windsor today, it will take some 19 years simply to reach the requests that are presently on file with the Windsor housing authority?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think too, Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to point out that just because somebody has registered for housing doesn't necessarily mean that that's an urgent matter—

Mr. Lewis: It's not urgent, no. You have to be out on the street?

Mr. Lawlor: Out in the middle of the lawn.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —that they don't in fact have sufficient housing. Everyone would like to improve their position, and indeed we'd like to help them improve their position. We are aware of the need for more senior citizen housing; we are building them hundreds at a time. And we will look after it as far as it is humanly possible—

Mr. Lawlor: Filing a family up—it is a disgrace. Do something about it!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —having regard for limitations of time, money and manpower.

Mr. Lewis: Present the ministry's estimates!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If talk would build houses the member would build a trillion.

Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. member for Windsor West have a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: The minister can't even supplement it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister aware that of the 1,541 requiring senior citizens' housing accommodations as of April 17 of this year, 1,268 have not been investigated by the department, and only 270—or 18 per cent—have been investigated to find out whether they really need the accommodations?

Mr. Laughren: He thinks they're not urgent, doesn't he?

Mr. Speaker: This sort of question is really not seeking information, it is a method of imparting information to the ministry, and it is not properly a question for this period.

Mr. Lewis: It certainly is.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is very good stuff. It's to get him to resign!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

JUNIOR FOREST RANGER PROGRAMME

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Would the minister explain why a 17-year-old Windsor girl, Donna Bridges, had her application for the Junior Forest Ranger programme turned down this year on the grounds that a girl couldn't take the strain, and yet I believe his ministry is planning to allow girls into the programme next year; when of course Miss Bridges will be one year too old to be eligible?

Mr. Lewis: The strain will be different then.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the hon. member for Windsor West for bringing this particular question to the attention of the House again, because if he will recall we did discuss this issue during the introduction of my estimates. I can only say to him that we have reached a decision to move ahead into a pilot project to have girls involved in the Junior Ranger programme—

Mr. Lewis: A pilot project?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —In the Province of Ontario next year. I do regret that the programme was not underway this year, where this particular girl to whom he refers could have been involved. But we have had to put an age limit on of 17. It is just regrettable that she will not be involved next year.

Mr. Bounsall: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If there is an opportunity to give another programme in your department, such as project SWEEP and so on, for next summer, would a girl like Miss Bridges, ineligible for this summer, be applicable in a project similar to project SWEEP?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, and certainly I would appreciate receiving her application, because of her interest in the department's seasonal work programme. I am sure we can get her involved in a SWEEP programme somewhere in the province.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Couldn't the minister and the department, in their largess, institute this year a pilot project for Miss Bridges? Surely it is not going to be that difficult?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Lewis: What is this "pilot project" stuff anyway?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

SEX RESEARCH IN SCHOOLS

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Minister of Education: With regard to the Grants-in-Aid of Education Research programme we have an amount of $6,000 here; it is entitled, "Effects of single sex in mixed sex schools on the relationship between masculinity and academic adjustment." What is the maladjustment it is talking about?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to send the hon. member an abstract of what these researchers are going to be doing.

Mr. Lewis: He knows it's in the abstract. It is not the abstract that's worrying him.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister how many categories fall under mixed sex schools?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur was attempting to gain the floor.

Mr. Foulds: I wonder if I could just preamble my question of the minister, by congratulating him on this approach. I would like to know if the department receives the completed projects when they are completed, and could he make them available to the members of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, we either receive them or we have access to them. Certainly, if we don't, it's my aim that everyone who can use them in the system should have access to them. We'd be happy to supply them to anyone who wants them. I don't think that as a matter of course we could duplicate them all and provide them to all the members; but if the hon. member wishes any, I'll be glad to let him have them. If any of the members would like abstracts of what any of the studies are that are indicated in those 35 that are outlined in title form here, we can supply those to them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Perth.

ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPALITIES FOR NUTRIENT REMOVAL

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. I understand that the Listowel sewage treatment plant is now being emptied into the Maitland River and again creating a problem of water pollution, as well as air—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would get to the question?

Mr. Edighoffer: I'd be very glad to, Mr. Speaker. Does the ministry have any policy whereby it would assist the municipality financially in rebuilding the plant system, because this system was designed by OWRC to handle the waste until 1974 and, at present, it is running to capacity?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I thought, by chance, I had something in the correspondence here today about Listowel. I saw something in the last day or two. I'll check into this and give the hon. member any information I have as soon as I can.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Edighoffer: By way of supplementary, I think if the minister would just take a drive by, I think he'd know what I'm talking about.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: With the windows open?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

BECKER MILK CO.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: How long will it be before the investigation presently being conducted by the Department of Labour into the status of Becker employees, will be completed?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member will appreciate, this study which is being done by our ministry does not deal exclusively with the Becker employees. We are also looking in other areas as well. I cannot give him a definite date at this time, but I certainly wish as minister to proceed as quickly as possible.

Mr. Deans: May I ask, by way of a supplementary question, whether the minister might be able to tell us the scope of the study that is presently being undertaken; and, secondly, whether the Department of Labour might be able quickly to determine the status of the Becker employees, whether they are, in fact, employees of Becker, or whether they are independent businessmen, in order that they can then proceed with the actions that they require to take?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, there is more than one ministry involved, as I have already stated in the House. That's why I can't give the member a definite date. I think, as far as the scope of the investigation goes, it's fairly wide. We're trying to find a solution, not only for Becker's, but in other similar areas.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

WOLF BOUNTY

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources regarding the wolf bounty: Is this still being paid at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

Mr. Burr: Is it the minister's intention to introduce legislation this session to repeal sections 2 to 9 of the Wolf and Bear Bounty Act?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: At the present time, it is my intention.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister intend to retain the bounty for registered trappers?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister consider allowing the bounty to continue in agricultural areas where wolves are affecting the farmers?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This has not been considered, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: The minister told me in the estimates that he would consider it. Will he make up his mind? What is he going to do?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The bill for repeal has not been introduced yet.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Snow presented the 1971 annual report of the Department of Municipal Affairs, the 1970 summary of financial reports of municipalities, and the report of the Ontario Food Terminal Board for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Charitable Institutions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, the Act provides for amendments to the Charitable Institutions Act to authorize private charitable homes for the aged to participate in the extended care programme. These amendments also provide for the payment of operating subsidies to these homes and establish standards respecting staff, facilities and services in these institutions.

HOMES FOR THE AGED AND REST HOMES ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this Act provides amendments to the Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act to authorize these homes to participate in the extended care programme. These amendments also provide for the payment of operating subsidies to these homes and establish standards respecting staff, facilities and services.

GAME AND FISH ACT

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Game and Fish Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to bring lions, tigers and wild boars within the scope of the Act; in short, to wipe out the hunting preserves that are being planned

Mr. Lawlor: Wild boars?

Mr. Sargent: How many wild boars are there in Ontario?

CHAMPERTY AND MAINTENANCE ABOLITION ACT

Mr Lawlor moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to abolish Champerty and Maintenance.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: They are going to abolish something that is already illegal. Why don't we abolish murder!

Mr. Lawlor: The purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to remove the obsolete offences of champerty and maintenance from the common law.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The fourth order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. W. Hodgson in the chair.

PYRAMIDIC SALES ACT

House in committee on Bill 109, An Act to control Pyramid Methods for the Distribution and Sale of Commodities.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments or amendments from section 1 to section 5 of the bill?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, section 1, subsection (j) the definition of a pyramid scheme.

On second reading I mentioned to the hon. minister that I wondered—and it is for the solution of my wonderment that I speak—whether this is drawn broadly enough in order to haul into your net all the malefactors and the vicious practitioners of pyramiding. Has it a wide enough ambit? You mentioned products, as I did earlier, but you did not mention services.

Now, the chief fault in the legislation at the present time—well, take Cashchek, that outfit working "save with Cashchek." I wonder if they are distributing or dealing with a product at all, Mr. Minister. They are dealing in a distributorship, where they say that you can have their credit card, in effect to deal with a wide range of services with people with whom they will put you in contact. You get a ten per cent discount if you go into those particular stores, and what you are doing is you are selling that service to your friends and peddling it to the general public in order to make yourself very wealthy very quickly in a nebulous and completely illusory fashion.

The chief fault in the matter, as things presently stand, seems to be one can go on with these numerous schemes, many of them seem to me to more probably involve services rather than products, and the bill only covers products. What does the minister say to that?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): I share the concern of the hon. member, but I think if you will go back to section 1, subsection (b), I think we have considered this is sufficiently broad to cover everything that might be in his mind. Commodity means any goods, services or rights or other property, whether tangible or intangible capable of being the subject of sale or lease.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, we will test it in the courts and see what happens, but they may be getting out.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 carry?

Carried.

Section 2.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a remark on section 2 (1) and get into the record on this particular section what is set forth in the report of the minister's committee on franchising.

There should be a registrar of pyramid schemes. They have a particular section on page 27, on registrars, the kind of person he must be and his degrees of competence. The schemes themselves are sometimes of a very sophisticated character and are run by, as they say, astute experienced operators, therefore the registrar must be a man of peculiar qualities. If he is also to deal in franchises he will be required to deal with some of the largest corporations in the country, with many extremely varied types of relationships. It is our firm belief there can be no effective control of either plan unless there is not only a very dedicated but also a very able man at the administrative helm. Has the minister any idea who this person will be?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, we haven't secured him for appointment, but we will, I think, by the time the bill becomes law. He is well versed in the functions of consumerism and particularly with the terms in this bill.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 2 carry?

Section 2 agreed to.

Section 3?

Section 3 agreed to.

Anything further up to section 5?

Mr. Lawlor: Section 5 is a very wide section, setting forth what the prospectus must contain, and as the hon. minister knows, at the latter part of the report there are seven or eight pages which enumerate various things which may or may not be contained, should or should not be incorporated into a prospectus; many of which, no doubt for a very good reason on the part of the ministry, have been omitted. I would like to bring your attention to one or two.

One of them has to do with restrictive covenants, where the individual buying the scheme is to be informed of what is called restrictive covenants effecting that scheme. In other words, there may be territorial limitations set up for the individual. There may be a certain restrictive type of clientele with whom he must deal. There is a very wide range of restriction that can be written into the contract, the ultimate contract, which doesn't seem to me to be necessarily elicited in terms of the prospectus, and which may have very delimiting effects upon the range of possibilities of anyone entering into the scheme.

Would the minister not think that perhaps that wider ambit might be set forth in his legislation?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think that if the hon. member will consider closely the implications of section 5 (d)—

Mr. Lawlor: Section 5 (d)?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I think that's right. Yes, 5 (d), I am satisfied that, for the purposes of the bill and what we are attempting to achieve, it will do that job.

Mr. Lawlor: You see what I am referring to. For your future perusal, if you think there should be any change in the matter, I have a drafted amendment on it. Page 61 of the report, at the small x, small ten, says: "A statement of any restrictive covenants on present or future business activities of the franchisee." And what the range of those restrictive covenants are is thrown fairly wide, and therefore I don't take that much exception to it. I simply point out in passing that it may improve the legislation if the wider ambit of restrictive covenants in this regard were taken into account.

Another matter which I would like to bring to the minister's attention is contained on page 59 of the report under M:

> "A statement as to whether the franchisor is either by contract, agreement, arrangement or otherwise, agreed with any third party or parties that the products or services of such third party or parties will be made available to the franchisee or franchisor on a discount or bonus basis and details thereof.

In other words, while you make provision for discounts, bonus agreements, limitations, and 10 per cent limitations or whatnot on them, any deal that a pyramid seller may have made with some third party out there in this particular regard may not, in my opinion, be covered under the terms of this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Again, I think that there would be agreement from my point of view with what the hon. member is saying, with the exception of the fact that he is talking about franchises and we are talking about pyramids—maybe there is a close relationship—but we will deal with franchises at a later date.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, again I ask the minister to take that into account.

Finally under this section, Mr. Chairman—I suppose this is as good a point as any to introduce this—nowhere in this legislation is there the submission, as in paragraph 9 on page 62, which reads:

> In all dealings between franchisors [again, let's just change the terminology to "dealers"] whether before, during or upon the termination of a franchise, the franchise shall deal fairly with the franchisee [that is fine. That is covered.] and it shall be open to the franchisee at any time to apply to the tribunal or to the court or to either (see paragraph 1 under "Recommendations") for determination of the rights between the parties, and upon such hearing, the burden shall be upon the dealer [I am changing "franchisor" to "dealer"] to show the contract between the parties was fair and that the franchisor's conduct was equitable in the circumstances.

In other words—and there may be very good reason for this again—your tribunal is not open; it is not the purpose of your tribunal to permit someone who feels he has been mulcted, or someone who wants an interpretation of his relationship as to the fairness or equitableness of the contract, to go to that tribunal on his own hook, so to speak, for a determination. The tribunal's functions are otherwise. Does the hon. minister agree with that? This may not be the proper place to put it in, but I thought perhaps it should go under the prospectus that resort could be made to the tribunal.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Again, Mr. Chairman, I think I must impress upon the hon. member that what we are doing here is trying to get rid, immediately, of the type of scheme that I think he wants us to get rid of too. And in this particular case, again as opposed to the franchise, we give the individual the right of rescission, which is spelled out further on in the Act; he may appeal to the tribunal in order to recoup from the goods which he has been saddled with if he so chooses.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the bill carry up to section 5?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I just want to get something on section 6 into the record.

Section 6 (1) i reads: "The scheme does not provide for the delivery of the commodity to the investor to a retail value of at least the amount of the investment." That is validly covered under 4 (f) of the recommendations, and they go on to say that basically there are two sections in this whole legislation that are crucial and without which the legislation would be rather nugatory and of very little effect.

The basic sections have to do with the one under question here, so that the investor will get the retail value of at least the amount of his investment. Now there is a provision that if the goods have to be returned, those goods that are not of mechantable quality will be subtracted from that outcome. The second section that is crucial is contained in another section, and has to do with the conspicuousness—they place it in distinctive block letters—of the terms of the contract of investment. There should be adequate provision to compel. At the beginning, it says:

> The contract of investment should contain a compulsory provision thereof, printed in distinctive block letters, a clause permitting the investor to return the product, or such portion thereof as has not been disposed of, and receive at least 75 per cent of the total investment, or 75 per cent of the appropriate portion thereof, at any time within six months.

There should be an adequate provision to compel the immediate return of the investment by the promoter, upon demand by the investor. There should also be a right to the promoter for release in the event that the investor is unable to return the product in a merchantable condition, considering all the circumstances. I just wanted to bring to your attention those two matters, one set forth in (i), and the one which is subsequently set forth in another section, but having to do with paragraph 8 on page 32, which are the core and central point of this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have no comment on that.

Mr. Chairman: Section 6.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment and then comment upon it. I move that item (k) of subclause (1) of clause 6 be amended by adding the word "unfair" after the word "is", so that the item would then read: "in the opinion of the registrar, the scheme is unfair or is not feasible."

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Feasible and unfair.

Mr. Renwick: I think I omitted the word "or" there.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard Mr. Renwick's motion. Mr. Minister, have you any comments?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment. I make the first obvious point that the word "feasible" does not include in it the connotation of "fair or unfair". It seems to me that it's very important in a situation such as this that we distinguish the power of the registrar here from the power of the registrar under the securities commission or the directors of the Ontario Securities Commission.

In the Securities Act, I think it is quite proper simply to require full disclosure, because there is a broad and sophisticated financial community made up of institutional advisers, investment advisers, brokers, broker dealers, all of whom are available to an intending investor to advise him with respect to the proposed investment which he intends to make.

Here, there is no such outside assistance a proposed investor in such a scheme can have. It may be that in time there will be, because there will be more widespread knowledge of the minute terms and conditions of such schemes, so that it would not be necessary for the registrar to have the responsibility of expressing his opinion with respect to the unfairness of the scheme.

This is the clause which provides, quite clearly, that the registrar is to issue his certificate of acceptance for filing of the prospectus, except in certain circumstances. I would ask the minister if he would seriously consider accepting this amendment?

My amendment simply is to add, in item (k) of clause 6, the words "unfair or", so that then, if I may, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Just a minute.

I would ask the hon. member to read that carefully. I don't think that he would really want to say: "In the opinion of the registrar the scheme is not feasible or unfair." I don't think that he would want to say that. I don't think he would want to say that it is "not unfair", would he?

Mr. Renwick: No. Let's have it.

Clerk of the House: Can I read it? The way it would then read would be: "in the opinion of the registrar, the scheme is unfair or not feasible".

Mr. Renwick: That was my proposed amendment.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That will not cause me any concern. I am in full agreement with it and I'm sure that everyone else will be.

Mr. Renwick: Oh very good; thank you!

Mr. Chairman: You've heard Mr. Renwick's motion to amend clause 6, item 1 (k). All those in favour?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Now the minister has an amendment in section 24. Are there any comments? Is there any particular section anyone wants to speak on?

Mr. Lawlor: I have a comment on section 9.

Mr. Chairman: Section 9.

Mr. Lawlor: This is the appeal tribunal situation. Now, within the powers of the appeal tribunal, they can refuse to grant a certificate of acceptance; or suspend. In those circumstances, they must send out a notice to the aggrieved party.

But nowhere in here is there anything along the lines that I indicated previously of a right of approach on the part of the individual to that tribunal to set his case before them. The individual, no doubt, could go to the minister, if he thought fit, or to the director; but then that would only initiate an investigation. But there's nothing in the legislation.

I'm suggesting to the minister that in future consideration of the statute, that might be an hiatus, as things presently stand. It would be in the best interests of all parties to try and get an understanding at the first level, and the least expensive level possible; and that is before that tribunal which you're setting up here. I suggest to you it hasn't been done; I suggest to you it would be a good thing to do it—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I was lost there when the hon. member started. Would you just tell me what clause you're speaking on.

Mr. Chairman: 9 and 6.

Mr. Lawlor: We're on section 9.

Mr. Chairman: Section 9 and item 6.

Mr. Lawlor: This is the role, powers, function of the tribunal; and I'm suggesting to you what I said earlier—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Okay.

Mr. Lawlor: —touching on the powers of this tribunal; that on page 62 of the report, it submits that it might be a very good idea to have the tribunal open for approach by an aggrieved party and giving hearing powers to that tribunal. At the present time it really hasn't.

People may approach the minister, or approach his department and set out their complaint. The minister may then, hearing only one side of the issue, and of course making an investigation to satisfy himself through the Registrar, issue a suspension. Then the reasons pro and con touching that suspension are heard in turn—or it may even be a refusal to grant the certificate that is heard before the tribunal.

But there is no jurisdiction in the first instance for an aggrieved party to approach the tribunal to set forth his plight and his inconvenience, or whatever the grievance may happen to be; and to have it adjudicated at that particular level. In other words, your tribunal takes certain steps within a very limited range; whereas as a hearing tribunal, it seems to me it should have a wider ambit.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I appreciate what the hon. member has said. I think that section 9, as was explained to me on question, is standard legal procedure. I want the hon. member to know that in section 12 the rescission provision exists; and even before going to that action, the party may, in fact, go to the registrar, who in fact may, if he deems it necessary, go to the tribunal.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh I see.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes. I think that—

Mr. Lawlor: But really, there is no provision to assure the registrar would approach the tribunal, saying: "Regarding this complaint, the fellow doesn't desire to rescind his contract, he just simply desires to get a clarification of his position."

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Right! Exactly correct! Well, because of the fact that the decision in regard to the prospectus is made by the registrar, he is certainly there to advise the individual.

Mr. Chairman: Is there another section any member wishes to speak on?

Mr. Lawlor: Just the word on the record; that's in section 11, Mr. Chairman. Page 34 of the report says as follows; this point was made previously too, but we may as well have it the way the report sets it out:

> We should like to emphasize that we consider paragraphs 4 (f) and 8 [these are within the report and nothing to do with

this bill, as far as numeration is concerned] are essential to the elimination of the major presently defective schemes. It is our view that so long as the promoter is permitted to accept an investment without giving a product in return, and without the right of the investor to return the product and receive back at least a major part of his investment, the evil will persist.

And that's why I'm so worried about services in this particular bill. There is no product to be returned, that kind of thing, And the recent significance—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Will the hon. member not agree with me—and I appreciate what he is saying—but will he not agree with me that that particular kind of scheme, when it comes to us for consideration, will never get off the ground? Like never!

Mr. Lawlor: Well, like sometimes! Like—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Like sometimes never!

Mr. Lawlor: Yesterday? Like it happened in Manitoba! They passed legislation under the Consumer Protection Act to control pyramid selling—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think—did they not prohibit it?

An hon. member: No.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I could be wrong. No? It was the same type of thing? I am sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Lawlor: It's not as elaborate as your statute—

Mr. Stokes: You are right again, Pat.

Mr. Lawlor: —and it's controlled in a different way. But there have been a number of fly-by-night operators who—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I know.

Mr. Lawlor: —have been in the province. They move in, they don't get themselves a licence, they move out very quickly. Of course, this is an attack upon the whole legislation as such, which only means that you are going to have to watch the situation carefully, because they are scouting and they are thumbing their nose—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We are aware.

Mr. Lawlor: —at the Manitoba legislation, and they are just as likely to do that to yours.

If you give them an inch to move in, with respect to the concept of servicing, I think they might take you to court, continue to operate in the meantime, and—well, all right, we will leave it that way. There is no doubt, under those circumstances, it may not get past the prospectus stage.

On the other hand, they may challenge the validity of your legislation over against their particular scheme in the courts and carry on their operation in the meantime under the blanket of the court proceedings. It is a great danger that you are facing here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You are right. I agree with the hon. member.

As a matter of fact, we have had that experience since the day that the legislation was first introduced in the House. I just want to simply tell you that arrangements are made that royal assent will be given to this bill at the earliest possible date if it passes this House today.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You have to give the Lieutenant Governor his exercise.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Where I want to agree with the hon. member is, we know what has happened in regard to his words about Manitoba. Our bill is, I think, a little more sophisticated than theirs and much more restrictive.

Now it is very true that in some cases, even if it were the prohibitive type of statute, they would in fact take you to court and in the meantime keep on milking the public purse. That is quite true.

But in this particular case they won't be able to and the penalty is rather severe. As of the day this is law, every one of those schemes goes out the window and there is provision of the law to deal with them. And when they have to file a prospectus, I think you realize that the department has sufficient experience that they know who the people in breach of the law are.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman—do you want to speak on this section?

Mr. Renwick: Section 12.

Mr. Lawlor: I want to speak on section 12 too.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Okay.

Mr. Lawlor: Can we go to section 12, Mr. Chairman, if there's no one else?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: On section 12, on the escrow situation, the report has this to say:

> We believe that the mechanics of bonding are too difficult to be effective. We suggest instead, therefore, that the registrar be empowered to acquire a proportion of all moneys invested in the scheme be held in escrow until sufficient moneys are available to implement the scheme satisfactorily. It may be that he will order all moneys held in escrow in some schemes, but in many of them, where there is an immediate delivery of goods, it would probably not be feasible to require an escrow of all the investments.

What I am interested in in subsection 4 of section 12, Mr. Chairman, is who holds this money?

The money is not held back by any third party. It is obviously not a trust arrangement—it doesn't go as far as a trust arrangement, that comes further on when there is defalcation and the Criminal Code is in full operation. Here at this stage you are depending upon the promoter to hold back some moneys in some fashion, but without any governance, without any guarantee really, without any reason to believe that he might not take off. There's no protection, and I am suggesting that the escrow clause here has very little efficacy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, it may be there is some danger; there is a possible danger, as there always is. We believe, in regard to the companies that we're apt to consider will go into business after the application of this Act, you can be very sure that we're going to be satisfied that the integrity of the firms concerned is such that the investor will at least have the protection of the decision of the registrar in granting licences. We have a similar situation—although I don't think it is mandatory, I am not sure—in regard to our Securities Act, wherein the moneys in those cases are held by trust companies. I would hope that, with communication and direction, it may happen also that it would develop this way with the people that we would approve.

Mr. Lawlor: I would hope it did.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: As I understand the distinction between 11 and section 12, one is the agreement to invest and the second one is the agreement to become an investor, which is the distinction between 11 and 12 I gather. If that is the case, I just have a minor point. The copy of the bill I have refers to section 11 in subclause 4 of clause 12? I assume that is simply a typographical error and the reference in subclause 4 should be to section 12 and not section 11, but I stand to be corrected on that.

Mr. Lawlor: You are wrong.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I think that—

Mr. Lawlor: Take a look, that one is the agreement, the kind of agreement between the parties, and that is what you are referring to.

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Under that agreement.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, we are talking about the agreement there, which is spelled out in clause 11.

Mr. Lawlor: That isn't what is spelled out in 11.

Mr. Renwick: I see, I see.

Do I take it that there is no provision for escrowing with respect to the requirement under subclause 3 of clause 12? Subclause 3 of clause 12 is a clause providing that where a person who has entered into an agreement to become an investor rescinds the agreement, then he is entitled to a return from the investor. Clause 4 refers—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, well, he may, it may be possible. I think this is what has happened in the last few days with representations that are coming to us where a man has entered into an agreement and he has all the goods and he wants to get out of it before he even starts.

An hon. member: Quite right!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: So there is really no need; this will protect him immediately.

Mr. Renwick: Yes, I don't want to labour a point if it's obvious to everyone but me, but clause 12 has a power in the person who is entered into the agreement to terminate the agreement within a six-month period by delivering notice. In that case, he is entitled to a certain return. But there is no provision for any escrow agreement with respect to that obligation of the promoter. The only reference to the escrow arrangement is referable to the preceding section, dealing with the actual investment by the investor.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am quite sure we mean the same thing in this particular case.

Mr. Renwick: When I first looked at it I assumed that there was more reason to require the escrowing where there is a preceding agreement to become an investor, than there was after the person had become an investor. I would like to see the escrow agreement for both cases.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You may be correct, but we believe that the six-month situation at least will give the man, if he decides to terminate his agreement, an opportunity to dispose of the goods that he has. In that particular event, if it develops that way, then the company of course will be responsible for the escrow provision for that period of time. Whereas, if the man who has entered into the agreement then has decided he doesn't want to go into it—now bear in mind that we are not talking about people that we are today prohibiting or trying to prohibit; these are people that we believe will have such a degree of integrity that if the man did come to us with his complaints, the registrar could make representations to the company and impose that return or that recission on them.

Mr. Renwick: Again I just want to say that under clause 11, as I understand it, the agreement by which a person becomes an investor, that that investor, having become an investor, will be entitled to the protection of the escrow arrangement referred to in clause 12, but that a person who has entered into an agreement to become an investor, under clause 12 will not be entitled, as I read clause 4, to any escrow protection for the moneys to be returned to him under clause 3 of section 12. It seems to me that there should be some protection for escrowing for clause 12 as well as for clause 11.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, I am satisfied this will take care of it; if not, I will assure the hon. member I'll take the steps to see that his request is fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Minister, I have a growing concern, in the area of our free enterprise system, of restrictive legislation coming down from the federal people right down the pipe. There are good and bad merchandising programmes, which could be called pyramid selling, but I think that we have to be realistic about this.

First of all, anyone who registers with your department to get accepted has to cover all the bases insofar as getting approval for his plan. But if in this clause you want to have an escrow feature of 75 per cent of the retail value, this is prohibitive. You are almost making it impossible to do business in Ontario.

It is a very complicated thing I am talking about. The minister made a statement that in the Ontario Security Commission he has a hold-back feature, right; in the OSC?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I didn't say that today.

Mr. Sargent: You said you had escrow in the Securities Commission.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh yes, yes, I am sorry; that is correct, right. The same as the Securities Commission does in regard to the funds that it has control over. That is right.

Mr. Sargent: Then what is the percentage? What is involved there?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I can't answer that. All I can say is that the policy is the same.

Mr. Sargent: My point is, I'm being objective when I say that if you take an escrow feature of 75 per cent of retail it is prohibitive.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to answer the hon. gentleman, to put his mind at ease by saying that the people who are in the business now, the people who we know are bona fide, the people who really don't want the kind of fast-buck operator that we are after, are satisfied with this arrangement. We have looked at the matter to this degree and many of them are employing this now. We are not out to further restrict anyone we consider is a justifiable and honest operator, and they agree with this. It is not as if we are imposing something on the fellows that you are thinking of, and we can name them, the fellows that travel the sideroads, and so on. We are not after them. We are not going to do anything to infringe upon their present method of operation. The people who would be concerned agree with the provisions that we're implementing here. We have gone to that degree of research.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I want to rise to apologize to my colleague the member for Riverdale. He, in his usual wont is right—listen to me,

Mr. Renwick. His subtle legal intelligence has penetrated an issue which went completely by me, and I want to add my voice in support of his position.

What he has to say about escrow agreement is perfectly correct; and as I say, it passed me. If any individual invests, turns over a substantial quantity of money to enter into the contract, derives no benefit therefor by way of goods or services or otherwise, or any form of benefit, there is nothing in the legislation to protect him with respect to the return of his money by way of the concept of escrow; whereas, if he gets some goods, then, in that case, on the return of those goods in good quality he gets at least 75 per cent of the value of those goods, which is held in abeyance or cannot be utilized to the advantage of the promoter.

He has to withhold 75 per cent pending the return of the goods, or to have that much money or be in a sufficiently liquid position to be able to return the 75 per cent. But in the first instance, and that's the worst of it, the poor devil hasn't even got the goods to keep. If he can't get the 75 per cent back, I suppose he'll retain the goods or something. Since the minister has a clause in there that the price of the goods must be commensurate with the retail value, then he has a worthwhile asset, whatever he may do with the cosmetics, or the fingernail cleaner, or whatever it is that they are touting at the time. But not in that first instance; so it is a point which should very much be taken into consideration to give protection.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member is right. I think I can accept what the hon. member is saying, except I would like to say this, and I think I made it in my opening statement: Surely, and consistent with several different arguments, no matter how strong or otherwise they might be, we can't protect everybody from everything. I would not believe that the hon. member, if he were in this particular position or walking into this particular situation, would invest any of his money before he received some of the goods. Then, to protect the man in any event, there is the bonding provisions which he can employ, and he would be then fully protected.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before section 24?

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Section 14.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, section 14 gives us an opportunity to disclose much more than we have in the past. I think it doesn't go as far as it should. I have some amendments here, namely, that we add another clause and make, first, what's there now as clause 1 then clause 2 would be:

Upon payment of the prescribed fees any person is entitled to examine any document filed with or issued by the registrar under this Act and to make extracts therefrom;

And clause 3:

Any direction, order and decision, made (a) by the registrar in pursuance of sections 8, 9, 12 and 15 of this Act, (b) by the director in pursuance of section 21 of this Act; (c) by the tribunal in pursuance of sections 9, 15, and 21 of this Act; and (d) by a judge of the high court in pursuance of section 23 of this Act, shall be set out in a publication of the tribunal available to the public and shall be mailed by the registrar forthwith to each of the investors in the registrar affected by such direction, order and decision.

The reason I feel this latter part is important, Mr. Chairman, is because in connection with any act by the registrar—perhaps he is willing to investigate something—he may find, by getting in touch with, and having contact with those who have invested in it he'll get a lot more information. If something is wrong and he's concerned about it and he notifies all the people in the register who have already been involved, he may find that he has a lot more evidence to back up his case. Or he may find that there's no problem. I think that in this way we are ensuring that those involved in this scheme are well informed.

I would appreciate the minister's comment on this. It is just a matter of assisting us in ensuring that we are not operating in a vacuum just by ourselves. We are getting everybody into the act who could possibly be involved to ensure that all the information is put in front of us.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister have comments?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am reading the amendment.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the member for York Centre if he would be good enough to—

Mr. Lawlor: I have one. Mr. Chairman, the only thing that bothers me is the business of making it mandatory, in effect, that

the tribunal publish some form of document, some kind of report. I am not very much taken back by it but do you feel that it's really crucial? I believe in the mailing, of course, and the information so that people should be completely informed about the disposition of their claims and rights. On the other hand, to force the tribunal to set up a special publication for this purpose seems to be pushing it a bit.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I would go along with what the member for Lakeshore says. Maybe the publication isn't as important—because of the fact that publications often aren't read; they are just a lot of paper and people don't see them. However in the matter of mailing. I feel that's the most important part here. If the minister feels that the publication would be too much of a burden and not necessary, I would delete that portion of it; but I do feel it is important that everybody concerned be notified. A man could be caught and he doesn't know about a situation; he might be able to get redress and assist the minister in correcting it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to elaborate here just a little bit. I am informed by my officials that the concern of the hon. member and the request he has here is reasonably well covered in the Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs Act. In section 7 (10) of the Act, the tribunal is at all times, periodically, required to prepare information and reports and details which are available, no matter whether it is decision or information. This is available, as I understand it, to the public without fee.

Therefore, it may not be the very information you want on this particular day, but the latest information that has been published by the tribunal is available. If there is anything of an undesirable nature about a company, the like of which you make reference to, or that you wish to have information supplied on, I am of the opinion that, without this detail and without fee, the information you are seeking will be available. As a matter of fact, I believe this is of such a serious nature that I will take it upon myself to assure the hon. member that it will be available.

Mr. Deacon: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, the point I want to get across is that in my view the most important aspect of this amendment is the mailing of any suspicion or action by the registrar to all who are in the register of the scheme being checked into. I think that the publication and the availability of information is a fine thing, and I had it out here to begin with.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Are you making reference now to the type of company with which we are trying to deal at the present time?

Mr. Deacon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Surely the hon. member would agree with me that once we outlaw the practice and once we require the filing of a prospectus—not that we are perfect, don't let me convey that idea to you—when this takes place, surely the information is going to be available to the public. Again I think if the public wants it, they are going to seek it. I think you are going to make it very onerous upon the department to put the responsibility on them to shoot all this stuff out; because as of the day this becomes law they will no longer be in business, none of of them. If the company which is filing for prospectus is suspect then it would seem to me from the information that has been disseminated to the public now and will be disseminated in the future, that if the public require this information they are going to come to us, and if they come to us they will receive it, without a fee.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting in this matter of subclause 3 that there is going to be any fee. What I am talking about is that when you issue a prospectus, that is not saying everything is forever going to be pure white and lily white. We know that. The main objective of a prospectus is disclosure, that is getting the facts out on the table. But a person might still misrepresent, and that could cause concern in the mind of the registrar, when he has heard reports of misrepresentation and is alarmed. What I'm saying is that when the registrar is sufficiently alarmed to call in the person and take action, the pyramid seller may appeal his action, but as soon as the registrar takes action with the pyramid seller, then I'm saying you should notify those people in the register. This is what I'm talking about.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member is really trying to protect somebody before he gets caught?

Mr. Deacon: Right!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Again, I think with the information that's available, and with the services that will be available within the department—I really am being sincere and

honest about it—I don't believe that requirement will be necessary. I simply say that on that basis I hope you will understand that I believe the situation will not arise to make this requirement and that we will be sufficiently cognizant of the entire matter so that we will take care of it administratively. That is precisely the reason we are bringing the legislation in.

I would hope that my hon. friends will not get us involved in this maze of additional work because, hopefully, the public will be sufficiently informed that great numbers of people aren't going to require this kind of service. I think that will be the case, indeed I'm satisfied that it will be the case. We will take our responsibilities sufficiently seriously to see that prospectuses that are filed are allowed to operate and will not require this sort of work; because you must realize that administratively, if the practice were to continue, we would be inundated with work. I believe that in due course, when the federal government takes action—and it seems to me that they will, it has been intimated, although I haven't communicated on the matter—and they prohibit it—and we have this filing of prospectus for control—I'm satisfied that that will no longer be a need.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, somehow I have a feeling that the minister and I are not communicating properly here.

I am not talking about the fact that this bill you are bringing isn't going to eliminate a lot of the abuse. What I'm talking about is trying to help the registrar, or the director, or the tribunal, to get possible additional information from everyone who has been involved in this pyramid selling promotion by having the registrar, or the director, or the tribunal concerned about some activity, notify everyone who is involved of action being contemplated about them or having been taken, or being taken.

I can't see where that would really necessitate a great deal of extra work. It's a matter of being certain that all information is out to those who are involved. If this occurs, maybe more information will come in than the registrar now has available at the time he decides there may be something wrong with a scheme. He will want to bring the pyramid group in and discuss it because he has had a complaint, but he may not have enough information about the situation and he may decide, on the basis of the single complaint, that there is no justification to bring the group in. But if everyone in the scheme is notified of his concern in the manner I have suggested here, then there is no question that he'll get all the information if there is something that is concerning others who are part of that scheme and are on the register.

I ask the minister to help his staff in this matter. To my mind he has to ensure that his registrar, the director, the tribunal, and the judge of the high court, would have everyone possible who is involved informed of what is taking place.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, if I may I will return to the remarks of hon. member for York Centre. He mentioned the register of investors. There is nothing in this legislation, that I can see at the moment, that institutes such a register, or makes it necessary for a promoter to maintain such a register.

Mr. Deacon: It's right in section 13 (1).

Mr. Lawlor: Which one?

Mr. Deacon: Section 13 (1).

Mr. Lawlor: I am sorry.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak to the first part of the proposed amendment. I have questions about the need for the second part.

The first part, I think, is a necessary part. I would, however, suggest that if the minister is prepared to adopt it that it's a matter that should be set out more by way of regulation. I don't think that correspondence leading up to, for example, the acceptance of a scheme filing, which may take some time and may be done in quite good faith and may be subject to confidential communication between the registrar and the promoter, should be available for inspection. I think that tends to distort what the scheme is that the person is becoming involved in.

I take it that the member for York Centre is speaking about the actual operative documents, rather than about correspondence—

Mr. Deacon: Right!

Mr. Renwick: —or other preliminary discussions which might take place. With that qualification, I certainly support the first part of it.

The second part of it I think has something to commend it, but I don't feel that it is a matter of urgent need.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the motion—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I wouldn't mind speaking to that a little—just very briefly.

If I felt that the function of the registrar's office were not going to be sufficiently open for the purposes I have in mind, I think I would be prepared to accept it. But I'm of the opinion that the function will take place this way in any event.

For the information of the member for York Centre, I am also satisfied that the registrar will have much greater means to obtain information than you would ever believe because of the communication with the public. I think we have had that experience already.

After the law becomes effective, I don't think—and I think this was inherent to what the member for Riverdale was saying—I don't think you would want this information disseminated in such a fashion that if in fact inquiries were being made, and if in fact the company were one of integrity, they were put in a position of jeopardy because of some undue snooping, or over some undue investigatory work on the part of the department.

Mr. Deacon: We are talking about—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Given that commitment to you from the registrar's point of view, again I say to you, although I have no strong feeling about it, I feel that the amendment is really not necessary.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, suppose the registrar isn't happy about some particular pyramid selling, about some operation, and he issues—don't forget this is not just his correspondence, this is every direction, order and decision. It's not the correspondence. I'm talking about every direction, order and decision; something officially done. If he makes such a decision and the pyramid group are unhappy about it and they go to the director, and they go to the tribunal, it may be that some of those involved in this scheme would like to come to their defence.

I agree with the minister that the registrar can go to the registry and send this out if he wishes to, and so can the others. I believe it would be a good idea to know that everyone is informed.

Even though the registrar has all kinds of places to get information, untold of places, I still think he should be sure everyone who has been involved and is on that register should be notified.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If we could go back to square one, before pyramids started, I am sure that the requirement would never enter into the hon. member's mind—and that's precisely where I expect this bill is going to take the present function of this type of scheme. I think we will find, within a very short space of time, that those will be the circumstances. If I thought for one moment—

Now, just a moment, you can shake your head, but if I thought for one moment that, after the bill is passed, we were going to run into the same type of trouble with the same type of people that we have now, I would do anything at this particular point in time to accept further restrictive methods for keeping them out of the field. But certainly I can tell you I am not moved that way.

I think if anybody wants the information or if anybody is sufficiently suspicious of someone in the field, they are going to be down at the registrar's office, or in accordance with the Act governing the department that information is going to be available to them.

Mr. Deacon: It is hard to get to the registrar's office from Timmins.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh no, it's not; you know better than that.

Mr. Deacon: The registrar's office can be a long way away.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Over there we give the best possible service in the Province of Ontario—and to very high standards; I can boast for my officials in that regard.

Mr. Deacon: I am not downgrading them at all. I am just saying that it's a shame not to take advantage of all the people who are interested in the thing and give that additional help to your department.

Mr. Chairman: Shall we vote on Mr. Deacon's proposed amendment to section 14?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those against will say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it and the amendment is lost.

Section 14 is carried.

Mr. Deacon: On section 15, I am concerned, as I mentioned on second reading, by the fact that it contains far too narrow a definition. We should be going far beyond the definition, which reads, "false, misleading or deceptive statements in any advertisement." I have some amendments in that regard.

In section 15 I move that the section have added to it:

1. No promoter shall make any false, misleading or deceptive statements in any advertisement, circular, pamphlet or similar material, or make any misleading representations to the public or engage in any unfair or deceptive act or practice that is connected with or arises out of pyramid schemes.

2. Where the registrar believes on reasonable and probable grounds that a promoter is making a false, misleading or deceptive statement or representation, the registrar may order the immediate cessation of the use of such material or representation; and section 9 applies *mutatis mutandis* to the order in the same manner as to a proposal by the registrar to refuse a certificate of acceptance; and the order of the registrar shall take effect immediately but the tribunal may grant a stay until the registrar's order becomes final.

3. Where the registrar believes on reasonable and probable grounds that the promoter is engaging in any unfair or deceptive act or practice that is connected with or arises out of pyramid schemes, the registrar may order that such person immediately cease engaging in his business or any part thereof named in the order; and on order, under this subsection, may be made subject to such terms and conditions as the registrar may specify in the order; and the order may be revoked when the registrar is satisfied that the unfair or deceptive acts or practices are corrected and not likely to recur.

4. No order shall be made under subsection 3 without a hearing before the tribunal unless, in the opinion of the registrar, the length of time required for a hearing could be prejudicial to the public interest, in which event a temporary order may be made which shall expire 15 days from the date of the making thereof; but such order may be extended for such period as the registrar considers necessary where satisfactory information is not provided to the registrar within the 15-day period.

This is really to broaden the rules under misrepresentation or misleading advertising. I feel that changing the present clause 15 to the amended clause 15 would greatly strengthen the basis on which the department can operate.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, very briefly in regard to the amendment; I appreciate the good intent of the hon. member, but clause 15 is standard throughout all of our consumer protection legislation. It has been quite sufficient to deal with advertisements and advertising and other reference matters mentioned therein. It has been quite sufficient to deal with the matter and I think it would be quite sufficient in this case as well.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I think there is good reason for it being sufficient in other situations, but pyramid selling is a different type of operation from other work that the minister and his department had to deal with. That is quite apparent, if he examines and reviews the problems that the government had bringing forward legislation that it thought would be effective.

It's a type of promotion and activity that goes far beyond the written word. Perhaps if he feels this is far too complicated, he might consider that we just take out the word "statements" in the third line and insert "representations"; and in the fifth line instead of "the use of such material", have "such misrepresentations."

In other words, there needs to be more than just this "false and misleading advertisement, circular, pamphlet or similar materials." There needs to be something which includes representation in the broader term. I've perhaps brought in an amendment that is far more extensive than the minister feels is required, but I think under this scheme he shouldn't confine himself to advertisement. In fact, I know he shouldn't.

I suggest that if he is not willing to bring in the steps I am suggesting here he at least change from advertisement to representation, or from statement to representation and deal with it under that type of description.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let me be as generous as I can be with the hon. member. As I indicated to him, I said this is very standard through all of our legislation.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Just a minute. I listened to you, now you listen to me. It is effective and very standard throughout. When he talks about the odd change that he would settle for, I want him to remember, if he was going to read the whole thing, he would have found it says, "reasonable and probable grounds of owners making false, misleading or deceptive statements in any advertisement, circular, pamphlet or similar—"

In my humble opinion, it would in actual fact take in representation as well; it will as far as I am concerned. What I will do, be-

cause of the length of the amendment and the complexity of it in regard to the change that we would have to make in standard procedure, I'll assure the hon. member that I'll take it with me; I'll study it and if I feel that it will add effectively to the terms of the bill, I shall bring it back by way of amendment and I will do that very seriously.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, though the minister has pointed out "false, misleading or deceptive," those words; the fact is it is followed by "statements in any advertisements, circular, pamphlet or similar material." If the minister goes to one of these pyramid meetings he will find the pamphlets and the circulars can be completely correct. Everything is fine. But if he took a tape of what went on, he might find there are a lot of additional claims made.

It is the same thing that can happen in the securities business when a salesman goes far beyond the prospectus itself. It needs to be covered very clearly. There is a way of covering representations in the securities legislation. I think that in the other legislation that he has to do with in his department, other than the securities business, there are written documents; there is something in black and white that people can rely on.

I am afraid that in connection with pyramid selling, one of the most persuasive aspects of it has been the meeting—the meeting where people have been really warmed up—and the statements that are made there. The minister in his definition has said only: "Statements in any advertisement, circular, pamphlet or similar material."

Now if he got rid of those words, "statements in any advertisement, circular, pamphlet or similar material," and just said "representations;" so it would read: "believed on reasonable and probable ground that a promoter is making false, misleading or deceptive representations." Would he not then cover the meetings as well as the written material that is handed out?

And if in the fifth line: "the registrar may order the immediate cessation of such misrepresentation;" section 9 applies, and we carry on.

I maybe should have had this material to him before, to consider before this day. I am sorry I didn't get it over to him, but the bill came up before I realized it would. I would suggest that he at least consider right now changing the words from, "statements in any advertisements," which implies only the written word; to where it is clearly anything that is a representation, in any form whatsoever, and is misleading; so that these misrepresentations are definitely covered.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will give the member a further commitment that I will have a look at it. I will certainly have a close look at his own amendment; and if I feel that it will add to the weight and the significance, or the importance of the bill, I will be delighted to bring it back.

Mr. Deacon: When would that be? In this session?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: At the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. Deacon: Would that be in this session; because I thought that once this legislation passes today, there are no further amendments, Mr. Chairman; this would be before third reading, wouldn't it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I wouldn't—

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member wish to proceed with his amendment at this time?

Mr. Deacon: Yes, I am moving—no, I won't move it, because of the fact the minister is making a commitment to bring this change.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, he is giving an undertaking—

Mr. Deacon: Is the minister making a commitment that he will definitely cover other than the written word?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Pardon me?

Mr. Deacon: Is the minister committed to bring in a change that will not confine him to the written word?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I am not; I didn't say that. I just simply said to you that I will look the situation over and I will consider both situations; both the changing of the words and also the total body of your amendment. Whether you want to proceed with it or not, it doesn't matter; I will do it anyway. And if I feel that it adds some significance to the bill, I will be prepared to come back with an amendment.

Mr. Deacon: Without the commitment, I will move this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Any more comments up to —oh, no, you moved the withdrawal of the amendment didn't you? Oh, you moved the amendment? I am sorry.

Mr. Deacon has moved an amendment and you have heard the discussion on it.

All in favour of the amendment please say "aye."

All opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it. The amendment is lost and section 15 is carried.

Section 15, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before 24?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 16; this is recurring more and more, and I think it is a necessary power. This is the right of inspection; the right of entry. I am sufficiently old-fashioned to think that the exercise of rights such as this by a government official should be subject to him obtaining a warrant from a judge, perhaps from a justice of the peace; but certainly from a provincial court judge, or a county court judge, or a Supreme Court judge.

It is a pretty drastic power to permit a registrar or government official to enter premises without having some check upon the question of whether or not he has reasonable and probable grounds.

I am not thinking for one single moment that the registrar would, in fact, abuse the power, or would attempt to use it in an unreasonable and improper fashion. But I have a reserved concern, always, where this kind of situation exists. It is always possible for the registrar of this government to reach, at any hour of the day or night, a provincial court judge, or a county court judge or a Supreme Court judge in the city of Toronto to obtain a warrant or whatever necessary document is required to enable him to enter and have a certain check upon the decision as to whether or not in the circumstances there are reasonable and probable grounds. I think a citizen is entitled to that kind of protection.

I am not going to move an amendment about it right now, but I am going to say that it has come up in other departments and in other areas. I would ask the minister if he would seriously consider that kind of protection for the registrar and for the public, and the particular citizen who may be involved, that a second look has been given to it by a judge who would be available at all hours of the day and night. He might not be in a very good mood at 2 or 3 in the morning, but he would be available, I am quite sure.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is not often that I can find great areas of agreement with the hon. member in recent date, but I think that I can agree with him on this point. This, too, went into this particular Act when it was being drafted as a standard quorum. I think I would share your concern, not because of this particular bill, but in the general sense. I will have a look at all of the Acts under my administration in this regard and see if we can't come up with something that would fulfill the goals—

Mr. Lawlor: Hear, hear—how gracious! You are very gracious today.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well now, you are too. You weren't quite so nice the other evening, but with the days you improve. You improve with time. I'll guarantee to the member that I'll make that review because I share the concern.

Mr. Renwick: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before 24?

Mr. Lawlor: Section 23 has to do with the restraining order, the injunctive powers. The report—Mr. Grange after all, a lawyer, was chairman of the committee—at page 63 says that:

> The tribunal shall have all powers, both legal and equitable, to excuse the franchisee [again I think the same analogy applies from that to pyramid selling] from performance of any contractual term, with or without the imposition of terms upon the franchisee, and to enjoin the franchisor from the exercise of any of his rights under the contract, and may make interim or ex parte orders pending the hearing.

Now, they are pretty wide powers reposed, by the way of the submissions, in the tribunal and not in the director. I wonder if the minister would care to comment as to why the power was transferred from the tribunal to the director and through the director to the courts.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Again, Mr. Chairman, as I look at this section I am satisfied that we see it here simply because it complies with the regular form of our other consumer protection legislation. Apparently it is not different in regard to form and I guess that's why it is here.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, may I just say to the minister that our relations, as I have indicated, have been altogether too pleasant of late and I only asked the question to seek

to embarrass him and to make this as obnoxious as possible, and so on. The way you have it worded is perfectly right and not an iota should it be altered.

Mr. Chairman: Section 24.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Have we got an amendment here?

Mr. Chairman: Yes; on section 24.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment here to section 24. I would like to send a copy over to the hon. member.

Oh, I had better send it to you. I just don't have all that many copies.

You have it? I'm sorry; okay. I was ahead of myself I guess.

Unless you want a general discussion on this first, I would be prepared to make this amendment now, just so that it's clear. You can have the discussion anyway thereafter.

I move that the bill be amended by deleting subsection 3 of section 24 and by renumbering subsections 4 and 5 of the said section 24 as subsections 3 and 4 respectively.

I think the hon. members who are more acquainted with the legal aspect of this question than I, will understand that it will give greater latitude and broader application of the powers of the local authorities. I think it would be improper to have the matter referred to the minister.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments on the amendment? Is the amendment carried?

Carried.

Shall section 24 as amended stand as part of the bill?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, on clause 27 I move that the bill be amended by renumbering sections 27 an 28 as 28 and 29 respectively, and by adding thereto the following section:

27(1) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to make unlawful the sale of consumers' commodities received by the seller under a pyramid scheme, the operation of which becomes unlawful under or by virtue of this Act, where the commodities were received by the seller before the pyramid scheme became unlawful.

(2) Upon application therefore, the registrar may in writing extend the time for the filing of a prospectus and the issuance of a certificate of acceptance for the purpose of section 3 for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 90 days after this Act comes into force where, in his opinion, there is a reasonable likelihood that the prospectus, when filed, will comply with the requirements of the Act.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the amendment proposed by the hon. minister. Any comments?

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, why would it require a period as long as 90 days? That seems to be an extraordinarily long period for an extension of filing time for a prospectus. I thought maybe 30 days is appropriate, but 90 days is a long time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think there is something right in what the hon. member is saying, except I also think that following the passage of this Act, we will have a tremendous number of applications made to us, particularly in the cases of the companies we referred to earlier today.

I don't think you or the other members would want me to move in, in a dictatorial way, to put any of these companies out of business if, in fact, they are the type that we accept normally. Or, on the other hand, if in fact the company is now in business and wishes to—I think I am going to be wrong here, so I will not touch that subject—but we want the time to be absolutely certain. If we do have a tremendous number of applications, we are not going to put them and their employees out of business while we are considering other applications which are before us.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I can understand that. You are using the term filing a prospectus in the same way that you use the term in the Securities Act I suppose. Once it has been filed and receipt has been acknowledged, that means the prospectus is in proper form. They may have been spending 90 days or quite a period of time in getting the complete information to satisfy the registrar. In fact you want this initial period particularly to give the registrar time to deal with them because of the initial problems.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: I don't quite appreciate the significance of subsection 1. It appears to me that provides that a scheme can become unlawful, and then it's open to the seller to unload his goods on the public. It would

seem to me that a seller should not be entitled to unload goods on the public. If for example the scheme became unlawful because of the quality of the merchandise or the inability to comply with some other requirements related to the goods, the seller shouldn't be allowed to unload goods which have themselves been the essential ingredient in the determination with respect to the unlawfulness of the scheme. I ask it simply by way of inquiry. It seems to me that the unloading of goods after a scheme has become unlawful, if the declaration of unlawfulness of the scheme related to the quality or nature of the goods, should not give an open door to the seller to dispose of them to an unsuspecting public.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No. I think you are right in what you are saying; but also, a number of these companies where there is a product involved, the product itself is not the problem that we are confronted with, as you know. It is the scheme that we are endeavouring to stop. A lot of these people—I could name you some of them—do have legitimate products that they sell, it's the basis of quite a number of them. But if we say that the pyramid aspect of the scheme is unlawful and we take that scheme out of existence, we are saying to you that we are not going to inhibit the fellow who has, in fact, purchased a goodly quantity of merchandise and is, in fact, legitimate. If he is illegitimate—which we will know by the type of company it is and by the type of product it sells, when he comes with the prospectus—I can assure the hon. member that the registrar will have the power to look at this situation and say that if the goods are not the type of goods that should be marketed, or unloaded as the hon. member suggests, he will not be allowed to put them on the market as of the decision of the registrar.

Mr. Renwick: The reason I raise the point, Mr. Chairman, is because the prospectus requirement states that it must contain the particulars as to the nature of the commodity, its source of supply, the warranties to be granted to consumers and the facilities for implementing the warranties.

It may well be that in the course of the operation of the scheme the failure of the commodity to meet that particular requirement of the prospectus would be the reason why it was declared unlawful, and then the—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Then the registrar would have the right to refuse not only the scheme but refuse the sale of the article.

Mr. Renwick: No, I am not talking about in advance. I am saying that a scheme could be filed and a prospectus filed and accepted by the registrar in all good faith, the scheme be in operation and taking place, the investors have invested their money, but then it comes to the attention of the registrar that there is a breach of the provisions of the prospectus relating to the question, for example, of the warranties which are accompanying the product, or the facilities for implementing the warranties, and he orders that there be no further sale because it is now unlawful. This would mean that a seller who had possession of goods for which he could not fulfil the contractual obligations with respect to the warranties, using that only as an example, would be permitted to continue to sell. I know the point that the minister wants to cover. I just question whether or not if it is with respect to the commodity that the scheme has been declared unlawful, then it seems to me there has got to be an exception carved out of that clause in order to accomplish what I think has to be accomplished. That is that proper goods available for sale can be disposed of by the person who has bought them and that's fine, but we don't want the public fooled by having to buy goods which are no longer protected under the scheme which has been declared unlawful.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And I am saying to you that it my opinion we can cover this through the registrar.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): May I, because this is exactly the same point, say that when it says: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to make unlawful the sale to consumers of commodities," it says "nothing"—it doesn't leave any leeway for the registrar to make any judgement. It says that nothing in the Act can in any way impede that sale. I am wondering whether in fact it ought not to say, "subject to"—I haven't thought it through as clearly as I might—but "subject to the approval of the registrar as to quality and warranty, nothing in this Act . . ."

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, I'll try—

Mr. Deans: No, I'm asking you if you would consider adding that—perhaps ask one of your people to draft something that would fit that in—otherwise everything in the Act is negated by saying that nothing in the Act shall in any way make unlawful the sale of the commodities. That sort of kills the point you made with regard to the registrar having

power. He has no power. It says that no one has power.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If the hon. members will agree, I shall endeavour to accomplish that and make it very clear in subsection 1 and bring in an amendment on third reading.

Mr. Deans: Yes, I would appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister how this section will affect those who have already bought Cash Is Best discount cards or are in these various types of schemes, such as the Unstoppables, Versalex and so forth. Do those people have to dispose of the merchandise they have been loaded up with, now that the organization that provided them with this cannot be made responsible to take back the discount cards, the soap and the self-motivation courses such as Dare To Be Great is operating?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I don't think we can make it retroactive. But in cases where there is a real product—and there are some of them, as the hon. member knows. As a matter of fact, a letter came to me fairly recently requesting that one of the companies be allowed to operate because he has been very successful in selling the product; it is a well-received product. He was not one of the people who got caught up in the pyramid aspect of that particular company.

Indeed, if that company were to file a reasonable amendment as to their present function, or a new prospectus that would keep them in business on the sale of that product, I would see that the registrar had a very careful look at it, because this particular individual has done extremely well out of it. The product seems to be acceptable, the price seems to be right, and so on.

In that particular case, if that company were to go out of business, he would have his product to sell. But in the case of the cash card thing, I just don't know how one would handle that; there would be no company around for him to collect from, because it would be gone the next morning.

Mr. B. Newman: The fourth line of the amendment mentions "received by the seller." Now, suppose it isn't a seller but a person who buys a distributorship from, for example. Dare To Be Great, the self-motivation people, because they now are trying to hide behind the idea that a person who buys in becomes an independent sales agent and that it is not a pyramid scheme. How is he affected?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He certainly isn't going to be taken after this Act becomes effective. What has happened as a result of what has transpired is only because we haven't got this Act through before.

Mr. B. Newman: In other words, those who have already been taken, they've been taken; but no one else will be under the scheme?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think that is a very fair statement. You are coming very close to Mr. Barnum's old-fashioned line.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment proposed by the minister carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Bill 109 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

> RESOLVED: That the moneys necessary for the purposes of the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, 1972, shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund until the end of March, 1973,

as provided in Bill 105, An Act to provide for Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees.

Shall this resolution be concurred in?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, this is a problem of procedure which has come up on other occasions. This is a request to the assembly to vote the funds to implement an Act which is still out in one of the standing committees and is under consideration. In the circumstances it would appear to me to be advisable for that bill, when it comes back into the House—and we will be requesting that the Bill then go into committee of the whole House—that the bill be dealt with before the resolution with respect to the voting of the funds for that bill be passed. I would ask in the circumstances that the resolution be stood down until the bill has been considered.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I would agree to that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 24th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. G. Hodgson in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES
(continued)

On vote 1805:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since we are dealing with the non-renewable resources, I want to refer to several comments that have been made by a so-called eminent spokesman of the mining industry in the past several weeks, having to do with the situation in the mining industry. I refer specifically to remarks made by Mr. Powis concerning the state of the mining industry itself. Referring to an editorial that appeared in last week's Northern Miner—I don't quote this newspaper very often and I do it now with a great deal of reservation—some of the remarks that are in there just can't go unchallenged. I want to quote briefly from the editorial. It said:

> Mr. Powis, with facts and figures and with much commonsensical argument, sheds a flood light through this fog of theorizing. "Dangerous nonsense" is the way Mr. Powis describes the arguments of those who attempt to under-rate the key role of the mining industry in this country. The manufacturing and service industries have, of course, a great part to play in economic growth, but unless we stimulate the development of primary industry we are likely to have no growth at all. [He goes on to say]:
>
> As regards foreign ownership, it is interesting to note that Noranda Mines, which celebrated its 50th birthday on May 1, is 92 per cent Canadian-owned. The figures for the degree of foreign ownership of mining companies are indeed, as Mr. Powis pointed out, fragmented and highly misleading. The facts are that Canadians control 67 per cent of copper refining capacity, 70 per cent of zinc capacity and 100 per cent of lead capacity.

It is patently dishonest for any leading company in any field, let alone the mining field, to stand up and say or to intimate, that 67 per cent of the copper refining is done in Canada and that 70 per cent of the zinc is done in Canada.

What he failed to bring out was that of 720 million pounds of zinc mined in the year 1969, 88 million pounds, or 12.3 per cent, was smelted in Canada—and the same amount was refined in Canada—but 632 million pounds, or 87.7 per cent, was smelted and refined outside Canada. So what Mr. Powis is talking about is 70 per cent of 13 per cent, not 70 per cent of the total amount mined in Ontario. Would you agree with that?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): From Ontario, wasn't it?

Mr. Stokes: From Ontario, yes. Of the 720 million pounds, which is the zinc output in Ontario, 12.3 per cent was smelted in Canada, exclusive of Ontario. But what he should be saying is, that 87 per cent of the production in Ontario is smelted and refined outside of Ontario. He goes on to say that 70 per cent of our zinc capacity and 100 per cent of our lead capacity is Canadian-owned.

Let us look at the facts for 1969. The mine output in Ontario for lead was 24 million pounds, and 240,000 pounds, or one per cent, was smelted in Canada, exclusive of Ontario. The amount of Ontario output smelted outside of Canada is 23,950,000 pounds; or, 99 per cent of our production is smelted and refined elsewhere than in Canada.

So, how dishonest can a leading journal in Ontario get, when it suggests that 100 per cent of our lead capacity is Canadian-owned, when only one per cent of our output is smelted or refined in Canada?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Send them a letter and they may put it on the front page.

Mr. Stokes: I just don't know how people can get away with that and how the Department of Mines can sit idly by and allow them to be so dishonest and to hoodwink the public to the extent that they create the impression that 67 per cent of all our copper is refined in Ontario, that 70 per cent of all our zinc is refined and smelted in Ontario and 100 per cent of our lead is Canadian-owned. Nothing could be further from the truth.

It seems to me that these people can just—and Eric Kierans is right; figures don't lie but liars can figure.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Did Eric Kierans say that?

Mr. Stokes: No. They are challenging Eric Kierans and saying that he is just getting carried away and he is being dishonest with his figures. There is nothing more dishonest than for any leading paper in Canada to come out with those kinds of figures, to try to indicate to the public, that the Ontario government is driving them out of business, that the federal government is driving them out of business; and that is why they have to take the hundreds of millions of dollars that they earn, while they are exploiting our minerals in Ontario, to Indonesia.

There is one major company operating in Canada now, which only had a quarterly profit of $48 million, that is going to spend in excess of $100 million in Indonesia to develop nickel resources there—in competition with the resources that we have in such abundance in this province. Any company or any industry that can afford to spend that kind of money in foreign countries is not faring too badly in this country. Notwithstanding the fact that they are taking a shafting, as they would have you believe, through the activities of this government and the government over in Ottawa.

I just wanted to set the record straight for anyone who read that editorial and got a mistaken impression of the situation with regard to smelting and refining in the Province of Ontario.

Now I want to get into something we discussed briefly in the question period. It has to do with the involvement of Algoma Steel and the Steel Co. of Canada in this steel consortium down in Marquette, Mich. I have written a letter to the Hon. Donald Macdonald, the Minister of Environment at the federal level. I asked him why alternatives were not considered for a Canadian consortium whereby we could develop known ore resources, or iron ore reserves that we have in such abundance. And since they say that it takes about four million tons of pellets to make on operation viable—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He agreed with my comments?

Mr. Stokes: Yes, he did. As a matter of fact, he did. I disagree with them for a couple of reasons. And since the minister seems to have got a copy of—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No.

Mr. Stokes: You didn't get a copy? Well, I will make a copy of it available to the minister. But I want to quote in part. He said:

> Finally, the cost of transporting the produce to Sault Ste. Marie was found to be excessive and subject to escalation. Moreover, neither United States nor Canadian iron ore or merchant companies were interested in participating with Algoma in one of these large Canadian iron ore developments. [Now, after having said that, he says: Pellet production from large deposits in northwestern Ontario, and small ones as well, if well located, are still considered economic and competitive with Tilden pellets, notwithstanding Algoma's decision, but must await market demand for their development.

Now, he is talking out of both sides of his mouth. He said that there was no way we could convince Algoma Steel or Stelco to enter into a consortium with Dofasco or other small users, because of the economies of transportation and close proximity of the source of the ore to their fabricating capacity, and all that.

But he is saying: "Pellet production from large deposits in northwestern Ontario, and small ones as well, if well located, are still considered economic and competitive."

So you can't have it both ways. It is either economic or it isn't; and he is trying to create the impression that they had no other alternative.

He says:

> Since transportation comprises a large portion in the delivered cost of iron ore, up to 50 per cent for some ores, the freight cost, particularly for rail, is an important consideration in weighing an investment decision.
>
> The total transportation component (water and rail) in the delivered cost of pellets from Lake St. Joseph to Sault Ste. Marie, is about twice that for Tilden pellets, and for the rail freight portion of the total transportation component, about four times. Thus the Tilden project could be considered a better risk because the delivered cost of Tilden pellets would be less susceptible to rising rail-freight rates. A further advantage for the Tilden project is that pellets from this property could be railed to the Soo at a reasonable cost during the winter months if shipment should become necessary then.

The minister knows that a good deal of the shipping on the Great Lakes system is subsidized. It's common knowledge that the St. Lawrence Seaway doesn't pay for itself and if you put it on a pay-as-you-go basis, there's no way that it would be competitive with other forms of transportation.

Now because of a very successful lobby by a good many people, say out in western Canada, who are very, very conscious of our ability to compete in world markets with our grain, for example, and our ability to ship stuff from east to west via the St. Lawrence Seaway, have found it necessary—and I think I agree with them—that it is a facility that shouldn't necessarily have to be operated on a pay-as-you-go basis. It serves the entire country, it acts as an economic stimulus and I think that it's quite possible that we should be subsidizing the St. Lawrence Seaway and not insisting that they make it a viable operation and pay for the huge capital cost, plus the interest.

But we have here a fact of economics that wasn't even considered. If you say, "It's cheaper to ship from Marquette to Sault Ste. Marie," I think it's common knowledge that that is a form of transportation that is heavily subsidized. And I'm just wondering, you know, what was the rationale behind the Ontario government's decision not to intervene and not to sit down in a realistic way to talk to Stelco and to talk to Dofasco and talk to Algoma Steel. Couldn't it have been possible for you to convince them that it would be in the interests of the economy of this province and, particularly in the interests of the people in northern Ontario, to use our own iron ore?

I know that the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario (Mr. McKeough) was interested in this and knew of the discussions that were going on. It seems to me he says, you know, this of course is the responsibility of the companies themselves.

> In this particular case our understanding is that Algoma Steel explored the feasibility of obtaining additional supplies of iron ore pellets in Ontario, required for the capital expansion programme at Sault Ste. Marie.

Now they were well aware of this for two years. The federal government was well aware of it for two years.

I'm wondering, since the minister has indicated that he's going to try and get some smelting capacity going in northwestern Ontario—this is a commitment that he made several months ago and he's in the process now of looking into its feasibility and the advisability of establishing some smelting capacity. What kind of discussions—tri-party discussions, with industry, the provincial government and the federal government—went on to explore the possibility of you satisfying the demand for iron ore in the Province of Ontario, particularly by the three users that I've mentioned, before they decided there was no other alternative but to import iron ore from Michigan?

As I say, in the letters that I got from the Hon. Donald C. Macdonald and the Hon. Darcy McKeough—

Mr. MacDonald: No "C."

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Donald S.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes. Goodness gracious!

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Mr. Deans: Keep them separated!

Mr. Stokes: Okay. Donald S. Macdonald, you're right.

Mr. Reid: He's the famous one.

Mr. Stokes: Yes. What kind of dialogue went on? And I see your deputy there, Mr. Douglas. I'm sure he must have been aware of anything that went on and he should have been a part of any of those discussions.

So, the people in northern Ontario aren't going to be satisfied that either the federal government or the provincial government couldn't have done something to enter into some kind of an agreement with the primary steel users, to make it attractive enough for them to use our own Ontario ores as opposed to importing some from the United States.

And, you know, we are talking about our balance of payments which is always aggravated any time something like this comes up. We are exporting large amounts of capital for that development; and then we are sending money across the border to pay for this iron ore, which only aggravates an already tenuous balance of payments situation. But they did it anyway.

I am wondering why the Ontario government found it necessary to sit idly by—and the federal government found it necessary to sit idly by—while we have got iron ore coming out of our ears, just crying for development. We have people in northern Ontario just sitting waiting with bated breath for the kind of thing that this minister says

could be a viable enterprise, where we develop our own ores for our own use.

We are even looking into a smelting capacity, and I am thinking in terms of stainless steel production. We have all kinds of iron ore. We have all kinds of nickel. At the same time you are giving export permits for raw ore from a good many or those mines that are just coming on stream. Have you not given an export permit to Matabi at Sturgeon?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Not for raw ore.

Mr. Stokes: I think you have. I think you have.

Mr. Deans: I would be inclined to believe the member for Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: For copper concentrates only!

Mr. Stokes: But you don't ship raw ore?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is a difference between them.

Mr. Stokes: But concentrates aren't processed. That is not considered processed.

Mr. Deans: Right again, Jack.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's the first stage of processing.

Mr. Stokes: It is the first stage, but it is not a process; let's face it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Not for raw ore.

Mr. Stokes: I just want the minister to rationalize the position that this government has taken in view of the need to exploit the resources we have in such abundance and the need to create jobs; that we are, in effect, exporting elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, if I may open my remarks with the answers to a question which was directed to me by the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren).

I think I will just read this into the record. I told him I would earlier today, and he said he had to go down to the other meeting but he would take it out of Hansard.

It is a question concerning the serious flooding on the Vermilion River. The reply is:

My ministry has been concerned with the flooding which has taken place from time to time on the Vermilion River in the vicinity of the municipality of Dowling. In 1970 my ministry launched an investigation into the facts which caused severe flooding following an intense storm in early June of that year.

At that time my ministry had the opportunity to study very closely the operating procedures adopted by the Eddy Forest Products Ltd on the Onaping and Bannerman dams on Onaping Lake, and Stobie dam at the outlet of Vermilion Lake. Eddy Forest Products Ltd has authority to store water in Onaping Lake by virtue of a licence of occupation No. 6133.

It has been found that the company is fully utilizing its storage capacity at the reservoir for storing flood waters, and it has prevented additional flooding in Dowling by diverting waters from Onaping Lake to the Bannerman dam to the Spanish River watershed. The Onaping dam has remained closed since the flooding commenced and on May 5 the reservoir had three feet of storage remaining.

The water content of the snow into the Vermilion River and Onaping River watershed has been relatively high. This water content, together with recent rainfalls and increasing temperatures, has resulted in the high run off with attendant flooding on the Vermilion River; particularly in the area immediately below its confluence with the Onaping and Dowling.

The operation of the Bannerman, Onaping and Stobie dams is not responsible for the current flooding in the municipality of Dowling. The power dams that are owned and operated by International Nickel are downstream from the municipality of Dowling and have no bearing on the flooding existing at this time.

I also want to put on the record a statement concerning the increase of price of gold. I think many of the members during these estimates, of course, have been watching what was going on in the world gold market and certainly I am as pleased—

Mr. Reid: Tell us what is going to happen to the stock and prices?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —I was pleased with the price of gold in recent weeks. In fact, it is my hope that this is only the beginning of a continued upward climb in gold prices. If this trend continues, I think we can look forward to a greatly lengthened life for our gold mining communities.

There is no question in my mind that this increase in the free market value of gold is

the result of the world's demand for the material for industrial purposes and for the arts.

There also appears to be a world-wide demand for gold by people who have seen the value of their own currencies fluctuate greatly in recent years—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): How much is stashed away in Switzerland?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and who are now primarily concerned to preserve the value of their own current assets. Also the very large reserves held by western Europe's central banks are an additional factor in this price increase.

Already it has made the operations of certain marginal gold camps in Ontario more economic. It is my hope that if the price passes the $60 an ounce price, it may make it possible for some mines that have already closed to consider reopening their mining operations. This morning, the price was quoted at $57.15 an ounce.

I would just mention to the members, at the present time, we have something like 18 gold mines operating in the Province of Ontario. Our production in 1972 was something like $41,830,000 down about $4.5 million from the previous year.

Mr. Stokes: How many of them are still operating under the emergency gold mining legislation.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Seventeen.

Mr. Stokes: All but one!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is only one.

Mr. Reid: Practically all of them.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, all of them. There is only Campbell-Red Lake. It is in the great riding of Kenora that is operating on the free market—oh, Kerr-Addison, I am told. There are two.

Mr. Ferrier: Some of them will be selling on the free market now is that right?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, they will. They will be reaping the benefits. But it looks very bright for the gold mining industry and, as I say, if this trend continues, we can look for a brighter atmosphere in the gold mining camps in the Province of Ontario.

I was also interested, over the weekend, to read of the announcement made by the Canadian Association of Diamond Drillers that Ontario was leading Canada in diamond drilling.

Mr. Stokes: They were crying the blues the week before.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We're leading Canada in diamond drilling and certainly this reflects directly on the mineral incentive programme that was announced last September. We have that lead and certainly with our programmes we intend to maintain it.

An hon. member: Is there any federal incentive?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, there isn't.

Mr. Haggerty: Are you sure?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'm positive.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Does the minister get a plaque for that?

Mr. Deans: He gets a scroll.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, studies.

Mr. Renwick: A scroll, a plaque or a diamond drill?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They're studying the situation, which they normally do.

But getting back to the member for Thunder Bay's comments, I should like to point out to him we talked earlier about Mr. Powis' comments in the Northern Miner. Certainly, I'm not in a position to comment on the editorial contents in a particular paper.

I will just point out to him that I will make sure that both the editor of that paper and Mr. Powis receive a copy of our annual report, so that that will clarify the situation to his liking.

Mr. Reid: We are a little suspicious of your report, too.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would also like to just mention briefly that yesterday I had the privilege and the honour of meeting with a group of mining people from Yugoslavia. They will be here principally to try to encourage Canadian investment to establish in Yugoslavia and to develop many known ore bodies, particularly low grade nickel ore bodies, in that particular country.

They discussed their problem for some considerable time, and through the interpreter it was interesting to find out that they were having extreme difficulty in attracting capital to that particular country because of their

foreign investment policy. I just put this on the record for your information.

They demand, in their regulations, that local ownership be 51 per cent and 49 per cent, of course, remains outside. They admitted to me, strenuously, that this was really throttling their exploration in mineral developments in that particular country.

Mr. Reid: It is a socialist country, isn't it?

Mr. Deans: Which country is that?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yugoslavia. I just make those points to you because I know that you are interested in them and it brought home something to me very, very strongly: in this period of discussion regarding foreign ownership, maybe we should look at their problems and possibly the select committee will look.

Mr. Deans: Why don't you recommend the select committee go and see it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Maybe they would look at it and we have an extra—

Mr. Deans: How can you look at it without seeing it?

An hon. member: Why don't you do that?

Mr. Stokes: In that connection, why is International Nickel spending over $100 million to develop mineral deposits in Indonesia? If everything is as rosy as you suggested it was, why aren't they investing it right here in Ontario? They earned it in Ontario, why in the dickens shouldn't they spend it here?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I certainly can't answer for International Nickel. There may be some reasons for them going to Indonesia, perhaps because of special tax concessions, but this I'm not aware of.

Mr. Deans: Did you ever think to ask?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: But getting back to the member for Thunder Bay's comments concerning the Algoma Steel step to move in with a consortium to develop a major iron ore development in Marquette, Mich., as I pointed out earlier in comments in the Legislature—I think they are recorded in Hansard, if the member would care to check. I think it's page 1753, about the middle of the page, someplace there.

Anyway, I referred then, as he has pointed out, that it was a matter of straight economics, that Algoma Steel did consult with us, they did meet with our department and they did present to us the problems that they were having, and their desire to expand their operation at Sault Ste. Marie. They did point out to us the cost of developing a new ore body. They did point out to us the problem they were having with Steep Rock and that they were running out of ore.

They pointed out the problems with Can-Fer, the cost, the capital outlay, which is fantastic. And then if they brought that property into production they would have to produce about four million tons, and they only had a market for about 1½ million. So they had to have a market for the balance, which they could not find, and it just boiled down to a matter of straight economics.

Then you must consider that the development at Sault Ste. Marie will provide something like 2,000 to 2,500 extra jobs in that city using a non-renewable resource from another country. If I recall correctly, during our estimates last year down in committee, it was one of the members of the New Democratic Party who said: "If you can't get the best deal possible for the people of the Province of Ontario, in relation to our natural resources, then leave the thing in the ground. It will be there. It won't go away. It won't go away; it will be there when you want to use it. Future generations will use it and develop it, but don't rush to give it away."

So we have a situation here where we are getting jobs, we are getting a tremendous number of new jobs in Sault Ste. Marie—

Mr. Haggerty: Are you sure about that now?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —using a non-renewable resource from another country, and when it comes down to economics certainly I don't think there is any one of us who would want to put that plant in Sault Ste. Marie in jeopardy and to force them to develop a resource or a new mine that is uneconomical in northwestern Ontario. And no one wants to bring an iron ore development into production more than I do, because I have a riding where, as the member for Thunder Bay says, iron ore is running out of our ears.

Mr. Stokes: Will the minister permit a question right now?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Sure.

Mr. Stokes: In that context, you have been bragging around here for the last two or three years that it is a reciprocal agreement,

that we are already importing well in excess of two million tons of iron ore at the present time. You have admitted that. Now you have said that for the expansion at Sault Ste. Marie you are going to need about two million more. That's four million, isn't it? That is four million. That's the very figure that the companies decided they had to have for the economies of scale? Where is the rationale in your argument?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would point out to the member that the two million tons that is coming in, the original two million tons which we spoke about, is spread over a number of different mills and there are complexities of ores involved in this particular problem, where they bring specific ores into specific plants for a specific purpose. It's not just one run of the mill.

This does create a problem. You just couldn't throw it in a bag and end up with four million tons of iron ore pellets of which you speak. It's not as general as that. There are other complications. I'll just leave that point to you.

The member has pointed out the possibility of freight subsidies. Certainly we looked at that, and we looked at the possibility of subsidizing Algoma Steel and I am sure that he knows the reasons why we didn't move along these lines. But you just have to go back to their decision, their 10-year agreement with this consortium and the small capital outlay that Algoma Steel had in its development at Marquette, Mich. You, as an individual, as a businessman, would certainly have followed the same course of events that they did, in going to Marquette and getting that order—it was just across the lake—rather than going up into the depths of northwestern Ontario and opening up a new ore body that would require a tremendous amount of capital outlay.

I want to point out to the member that there was discussion, as he pointed out, with Treasury and Economics, there were discussions with our department, and we were in conversation with the federal government. I will admit they were as concerned as we were that this was happening. We really couldn't find a solution to encourage the development of a new ore body in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to deal with another matter. This concerns the whole questions of the development of the lignite deposits in the Onakawana area. During the election campaign, the Premier (Mr. Davis) was in my riding and he made the announcement on Oct. 11, while in Timmins, that we would know within four or five months when work would likely commence on the project there to develop the lignite and to get on with the job of knowing whether a plant could be put into effect.

Mr. Haggerty: Sounds like a promise for the next election.

Mr. Ferrier: This lignite deposit has been known to be there for 40 years. Every so often it is brought out into the open and a lot of enthusiasm is generated around it and then it wanes for a while.

Mr. Renwick: You want to bring it out again when Mr. Spooner runs again in the next election.

Mr. Ferrier: There is another problem I will deal with him a little later on. Last spring the minister was up there with some of his officials and probably some other members. They brought back to the Legislature a couple of chunks of this lignite and we saw it. The discussion has been quite active that this lignite deposit was going to go into production.

It has been explained to us that it is a very wet material and that there were certain problems in being able to use it because of the dampness that is in it. They went so far as to ship a trainload of it to Thunder Bay to the hydrothermal generating plant there. It was tested and I think there were certain problems involved in it. But it appears, from the Premier's statement up in my riding during the election campaign, that we are going to be able to see the development of this lignite deposit within four to five months. It was about all he had to say to the people there, except another lot of sweet talk, and so on.

Anyway, last Tuesday, May 9, in the House, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) announced in this House that there was now going to be a study involved as to the ecological impact, not only of the possible development of this lignite deposit, but also of the James Bay project by the Quebec government. I think there are a few probems Quebec is going to run into as far as that development is concerned, but I won't say too much about that. I understand one of the things is that there is not a very ready supply of sand and gravel for the concrete that they would want to use on that project.

Anyway, this study is now going to be taking place as to ecological problems that will be involved should this lignite deposit go into production. I wonder how much of a feasibility study has actually gone into that possible development of lignite on Onakawana.

The Manalta Coal Co. now owns the body and is proposing to put it into production and sell the power to Hydro, presumably at a profit. One wonders why Ontario Hydro never moved in there and developed this ore body, if it's of such value.

I certainly feel that should we be able to get that ore body into production it will be of benefit to that section of the province. They certainly need some kind of development up there. I'm all in favour of it going ahead and I hope this department is as in favour of it as I am and the people of the northeast are, because we're very concerned that there be more developments take place in that area.

There was also mention a couple of years ago that Imperial Oil, I think, was involved in a development of a columbium deposit up in that area. I haven't heard anything about that for the last couple of years. Perhaps, in replying, the minister could state if he knows anything of the stage of development and exploration of that deposit there.

If this company doesn't go ahead with the production of electricity from this lignite, is the other angle being looked at—developing natural gas from the lignite? I understand there is a lignite deposit in North Dakota, and it is being developed, or it is proposed that it be developed, to produce natural gas from it. A company known as Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co. of Detroit and the North American Coal Corp. of Cleveland have signed an option under which North American agrees to set aside 1.5 billion tons of lignite reserves in North Dakota for Michigan-Wisconsin's conversion into gas. Evidently, lignite has potential not only for Hydro, but also for natural gas.

Can you lick this problem of the moisture? If you can lick it, what is the ecological problem? Is it a problem of air pollution that's likely to develop from the burning of this material or is it the heating of water around it? Perhaps we could get an idea of how serious the problem might be of environmental pollution and disturbance of the —is it the ecosystem, as they call it?

I wonder if the minister could give us some idea of what's really in store there and whether—he won't tell us if we're being conned. I hope we're not. I hope the department is finally going ahead after 40 years to put this thing into production and see that another part of the northeast gets some of the development it so badly needs.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased that the hon. member for Cochrane South has brought this matter up. I think I'd have to say that the Prime Minister, during that great event last October, certainly shared the excitement of all of us in the north when he made the announcement that there would be more activity in the Onakawana area with regard to the development of that lignite deposit.

Mr. Haggerty: That is only one area!

Mr. Stokes: All he meant was a study, eh?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This enthusiasm, this excitement, was reflected further in the Throne Speech at the opening of this session of Parliament, as the members well know.

Mr. Deans: You are really enthused, by the way you speak.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And we have moved it further than that—

Mr. Haggerty: All in good time.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —because we have entered into an agreement, a tri-partite agreement, with Ontario Hydro, this particular department and Manalta. Manalta is the former Alberta Coal Co. which have the expertise in strip mining. After some investigation of that particular company, and in view of the site and knowledge of their ability, certainly they were the one—because they had the exploration rights to this particular area—that should be contacted to work with Hydro in a half million dollar feasibility study that will be moving ahead.

I would point out to the members that it is estimated that there is about 200 million tons of a low grade lignite, which has a high water content. But it will support, from the preliminary indications we have now, a power plant of about 1,000 megawatts, half the size of the Lakeview generating plant, near Toronto.

The capital investment required to put such a plant in operation would be approximately $290 million. Construction would take four to five years and would employ at the peak construction period about 700 men. It

would generate, for the Ontario Northland Railway alone, about $4 million of additional revenue. So I am sure with those figures the member for Cochrane South will be as excited as I am about this development moving ahead.

Now I think he is aware that we intend—

Mr. Stokes: What does Hydro think about it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Hydro are very interested, because they are part of the three-party agreement and they will provide the technical knowledge in the initial part of the feasibility study that we are going into. It is an in-depth study. In fact I have just been informed that the proposal has been received today, and we can expect exploration on the site and the start of this particular study to begin next month. So we are on the way and I think that this is the most serious step ever taken with regard to the development of the lignite deposit. It certainly will create problems for us, but we are moving ahead with those studies.

The ecology, of course, is something we intend to maintain. As my colleague mentioned just last week, a study will be undertaken as to the effects of any development that may occur in that particular area. I think, with the public attention focussed on this particular area, it is imperative that we do this study first. And that we move along, possibly just ahead of the feasibility and the mineral study which we are doing, to find out what effects will occur.

But I would point out to the members that we are dealing, and I am sure the member for Cochrane South will agree with me, with an area that is mainly muskeg. There is estimated anywhere from 40 feet to 100 feet of over-burden. And they don't mine this underground, they just strip it. But we want to make sure that when the development is completed that the area will be left in a suitable condition. I had the pleasant opportunity of going to Estevan, Sask., and to Edmonton.

Mr. Stokes: You went to Hamilton Botanical Gardens.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, no. That was another trip.

Mr. Stokes: We will talk about that later.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And up to the Great Canadian Oil Sands last January to look at the development in those areas. And the tremendous strip mining projects that are going on in that particular area—and to see the rehabilitation that is also done in conjunction with these developments.

I must say that I was most impressed with the operations of the Alberta Coal Co. there and their desire, of course, to leave the land in a good, respectable condition.

But the lignite at Onakawana is, as I said earlier, heavy in water content but very, very low in sulphur content, so we do not have a real problem with regard to the emission of sulphur dioxide in that particular area. We are certainly pleased about this.

But the idea behind it, or the major steps, will be a steam turbine generating plant that will use cyclone furnaces. The lignite will have to be pulverized and used in these high-speed cyclone furnaces similar to those being used now south of Chicago and in South Dakota.

As the member so pointed out, we did take a quantity of lignite to the Thunder Bay generating station, but the—

Mr. Stokes: They weren't too happy with it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, but the type of furnace that they had there just did not lend itself to this particular type of lignite. And from the pilot projects they have had on a smaller scale, the tests that have been undertaken are very, very encouraging. In fact, the Btu content is much higher than some of the lignite that is being used in many countries around the world.

So all indications are good right now, and the indications are that we will be moving ahead next month. I am most encouraged with the involvement, of course, of my particular department; and Ontario Hydro, of course, will be providing their expertise. So we are on the right track and we hope to see some further developments move along as the summer progresses.

In fact, the leader of the Liberal Party made mention to me that when we take the members on a tour of northeastern Ontario that we stop at Onakawana and let them have a look at the deposit there. There's really not much to see—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, there is not much there. But certainly this concerns us very, very seriously. Because I know that the members on the other side of the House are as interested as we are in having that

Ontario resource developed for the benefit of the Ontario people.

Mr. Ferrier: Well I would just like to follow this a couple of steps if I could.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute, we have a speaker.

Mr. Ferrier: I just want to ask a couple of questions and I will be glad to yield the floor. Am I to understand really then that this ecological study is because this is going to be strip mining, and it is the first strip mining that we have had in Ontario, and that you will find it probably necessary after this study to come in with some type of amendments to the Mining Act, or regulations to provide for rehabilitation of the area in the long run?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ferrier: I know at this point of time it is up in the wilderness and that there is nobody there. And I suppose with all the concern about the environment, that it is reasonable that we look ahead as you are doing in this study. Will you be bringing in these kind of regulations or amendments if they are found necessary? I also take it that that tour to the north-east is definitely on and that we will be coming to that—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They don't state that.

Mr. Ferrier: Well, I hope that you are coming to that great part of the province. I know we enjoyed the northwest last time, and we will enjoy the northeast just as much. Or more.

Mr. Deans: You have done it now.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Suspense! Suspense! Just patience.

Mr. Ferrier: Also would you mind commenting on that columbium—I think it is columbium that Imperial Oil were engaged with?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In answer to the member's questions, certainly we are moving ahead with our ecology study because we do want to make sure that the environment is left. And as I said we are looking at the effects of the strip mining effect in that particular area and any disruption to native people who may be within the immediate area, who may be working there. Because the idea—and our concern—is to use as much local help as we possibly can, even if it requires major retraining programmes. This has been on the discussion table right from the very outset.

We are also going to look into the possibility of any diversion of water and rivers. This will be tied in, of course, to the Quebec James Bay project to find out if there will be any overflow into Ontario. So it is the whole area that is being looked at. We don't want to have this as an afterthought. We want to move in and be in tune with the development that takes place in that particular area. So the two do go hand in hand.

In regard to the Imperial Oil columbium deposit, there is no activity at that particular deposit at the moment. This is about 45 miles southeast of Moosonee; because of the lack of a good market for columbium there is no activity at that particular site. But there is electrical power, you know, if Onakawana does go ahead and the proper transportation facilities are provided in that area, and it may well be a further encouragement on behalf of this company to move ahead with that development.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'll be brief. I just really wanted to rise and shed a little more light on what the minister was saying and perhaps correct a misrepresentation I feel he has made. He mentions Steep Rock iron mines which, of course, since we are all getting into the act today, happens to be in my riding of Rainy River, and the minister indicated in his remarks that Steep Rock was running out of ore.

I don't believe that's exactly the situation. I think they are running out of easily accessible ore, perhaps the more high grade ore, and it's becoming increasingly more expensive to get at the ore. Really the ore is there and we hope that Steep Rock, of course, will continue to operate for quite some time.

I had one observation to make, Mr. Chairman, and that is that in this whole matter of Algoma and Lake St. Joe and Steep Rock, and so on, I feel we have perhaps to be very careful that we don't oversimplify the whole complexity of the problem. I think we often do ourselves and the people we represent a disservice when we try to oversimplify these problems and don't pay enough attention to the complexities of detail that are involved.

I might say just as an aside that it's perhaps a good and sufficient reason why we,

particularly, in the opposition, should be provided with more background research facilities and money so that we can do a proper job in opposition, but we can leave that debate for some other time.

I think the minister touched the highlights of some of the problems as to why Algoma made the decision they did. I have been in touch with various people in the mining industry, including Steep Rock Iron Mines, who seem to feel that the decision made by Algoma was the correct one under the circumstances. No one is more interested than I in seeing northwestern Ontario go ahead and our own resources being developed, but I think we have to be reasonable in this thing.

In my opening remarks I pointed out that I believe we are dealing in an international situation and we don't live in a closed economy or a closed society in the Province of Ontario. We have to consider the intricacies of the international market, both in this particular problem and generally speaking.

I would hope that the government will do all they can to assist Steep Rock in developing the Lake St. Joe property. One of those ways would be to build a road between Atikokan and Ignace.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Will that get the stock moving?

Mr. Reid: I just thought I'd put that in for the minister's benefit.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Duly recorded.

Mr. Reid: That is all I want to say regarding that at the moment.

Mr. Good: We knew you got up for some reason. We weren't sure why you got up, but now we know.

Mr. Reid: Fortunately, or unfortunately, Dryden is in the minister's constituency, but one has to make a choice somewhere, or sometime or other—

Mr. Deans: Maybe somebody should explain their estimates.

Mr. Reid: —although it is a little hard, since we are not always sure ourselves. The minister has—

Mr. Chairman: Get back to vote 1806.

Mr. Reid: This is much more interesting, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ferrier: Vote 1805; don't jump ahead of us now.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1805.

Mr. Reid: I want to add my support to the comments made by my colleague from York Centre (Mr. Deacon) in which he discussed the Ontario Energy Board and suggested most strongly to the minister that where there is a monopoly held by one firm, or one government corporation, whichever it may be, in the field of public utilities that they should come under the very close scrutiny of some kind of public body, preferably the Legislature, or a committee of the Legislature. Barring that, some body such as the Ontario Energy Board should have jurisdiction to investigate the cost, the rates and the borrowings of these various monopoly utilities.

We draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that a year or so ago, I forget when now, a special committee of the Legislature, the committee on natural resources, tried to investigate what was going on in Hydro and the costs that Hydro was projecting for the next 10 years and the borrowing it was going to have to do, but there was no way, what with our limited expertise or with the short amount of time that we had available to us, that we could do a really good and sufficient job in the public interest.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I would just urge that the minister give serious consideration to expanding the role of the Ontario Energy Board to take in these matters.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to follow on the theme that the hon. member for Cochrane South had been on previously and that is dealing with the lignite deposits in the Province of Ontario.

I don't know if the minister is aware of it or not but there is a serious shortage of energy in the United States at the present time. I think it is almost at the crisis stage right now. Then I think about the development that is going to take place on Lake Erie shore line—one in particular at Nanticoke, where we have the power generating station just completed and in operation—we have the proposed expansion of Stelco in that area and, I think of Dominion Foundries at Port Burwell.

I was just wondering, with the shortage of coal in this particular area, why that particular development on Lake Erie when we are concerned about the ecology of northeastern Ontario? No one seems to care about the ecology of this particular lake basin where we are going to have all this proposed mass development within the next 10 or 15 years. Maybe less than that.

I was wondering, with the shortage of fuel supply, particularly coal, in the United States, why can't we give a little gentle persuasion to these giant corporations and perhaps take a look at northern Ontario where we have the iron reserve ore bodies there? We have the other energy reserve lignite bodies there to manufacture steel. Why not take a good close look at the ecology of the Lake Erie basin and compare it with northwestern Ontario or northeastern Ontario? Then we could tell these companies: Take a good look at this and build those plants in the north perhaps—shift some of the problems of growth from southern Ontario up to northern Ontario, and give us a little bit of clean air for a change and clean water.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Atta boy!

Mr. Good: Too far away from the market.

Mr. Haggerty: No, I don't think it is.

Mr. Good: I know. That's why they won't go out there.

Mr. Haggerty: They're closer to the sources of energy and mineral resources there.

The other problem that I'd like to discuss, Mr. Chairman, is the matter of drilling in Lake Erie. I notice there have been a number of complaints from the local fishermen out on Lake Erie, that are having their nets destroyed by markers, apparently, that the drilling companies are allowing to be left in the waters. I was just wondering if the minister can initiate some type of programme so that they don't allow this to exist in the waters of Lake Erie.

The other point I'd like to ask the minister is, have there been any oil findings in the development of natural gas on the drilling in Lake Erie?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is not allowed.

Mr. Haggerty: Could the minister tell me if any of the gas that is generated from the wells there is being exported to the United States, particularly in the Fort Erie-Buffalo area?

The other matter I want to bring to the minister's attention deals with energy too. I believe I can recall an article in the Welland Tribune not too long ago, where some 900 gas customers in that particular area of Haldimand county had been given notice that Union Gas will no longer service this particular area.

I think one of the comments in the newspaper was that the lines had become obsolete, or aged, and it cost too much to repair them. Then again, I look at the Globe and Mail headline on May 18, "Union Gas Year's Profit Increases to $14,497,000 as Total Revenue Rises to $143,422,000." I think in the overall picture the increase in the profits alone, from 1970 to 1971, was $1,758,000. We find, when we look at the substantial increase in profit, that the company can't afford to provide service to 900 customers in this particular area.

I would like to know what the minister's comments would be on these matters I've placed before him.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, certainly, I was very interested in the hon. member for Wellington South and his comments—

Mr. Haggerty: Welland South.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —that the huge iron ore development plant for Nanticoke should be directed to northern Ontario.

Mr. Ferrier: We agree with him.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think you have my support to that request, since we are looking for this type of fabrication in northwestern Ontario—and northern Ontario, I am sure. But when you relate that to the development of a lignite deposit, I'd like to point out to him, the development would have to be up there because you just can't transport lignite of the quality of that at Onakawana.

He wonders about the environmental studies that are going on in northwestern Ontario, or northern Ontario, rather, and he relates that to Nanticoke. I want to point out that there is an agreement between Hydro and this ministry and Texaco regarding an environmental study and controls for Nanticoke. This is a whole new plant and a new complex. They will have to, of course, live up to all the environmental requirements of the Department of the Environment. Certainly that includes any input that our department can put in. But we are going into a whole new concept and all the modern-day requirements will have to be

met. I really don't see any fear of any pollution problems in that particular area—

Mr. Haggerty: That's wishful thinking and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —with regard to this particular development.

He mentions about the drilling rigs left in Lake Erie. We don't have any specific complaints.

Mr. Haggerty: These are buoys.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Buoys?

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, markers.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, we do mark them, and they are marked, of course, for a purpose. But if he has any specific complaints about nets being caught, or wrapped around these rigs, I would be only too pleased to hear from him and follow up a little closer, specifically.

There are no oil wells operating in Lake Erie—gas wells only. If there is oil struck, of course, they must report it, and this is a requirement of the department. To our knowledge, there is no export of gas from Lake Erie to the United States.

He made some mention about Union Gas's decision in Haldimand county to discontinue servicing some old production lines which were formerly under the Dominion Gas Co. They took over about 15 years ago and these lines are becoming very, very obsolete, very expensive to operate, and they just find it uneconomical to continue.

But I am sure he is aware that Union Gas is negotiating with each one of the companies to move into a new form of energy, or fuel. If they have to go into electricity or fuel oil, then they are being assisted by Union Gas in the changeover. So I think from the information that we've—

Mr. Haggerty: Expensive to operate?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, no, it is being subsidized by Union Gas. This is the negotiation they are entering into. They are actually going into some form of subsidization on an individual basis.

So, I think, from the information reaching me that Union Gas are being very, very generous and very, very co-operative with the local people in this changeover and in this problem. Certainly it relates directly to economic conditions and costs.

Mr. Haggerty: What about the changes? Don't they have some kind of payment on those alone.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, I don't think we can force them to run something that is uneconomic. This is the problem, and if they are willing to assist in the switchover, then it's very difficult to force them any further than that.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, they are not that hard up when they can come through last year with a profit of $1.7 million and some thousand dollars. Surely, they can pass on some of this to the 900 customers in that area now and build the new lines that are required?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak to the minister for a few moments and get some information from him about the state of affairs in regard to the sand dunes. My understanding is that Dr. Tovell is conducting an investigation into this. The minister did indicate some little while ago—the date escapes me at the moment—but that as soon as the frost was gone the investigation could be completed in a matter of a few weeks.

I am interested to know from the minister exactly what it is that Dr. Tovell is doing there. How long has he actually been on site doing the investigation, and what has he ascertained to this point as regards to the diminishing sand dunes? And then we will proceed from there.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the member from Wellington—

Mr. Stokes: Wentworth.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Welland South. He made some mention about the Union Gas suspending gas operations in Haldimand county.

I would point out to him that the first step in their procedure to stop supplying that area has to be to get an agreement with the local people. And then they have to appear before the Ontario Energy Board to make a case.

It is not a simple procedure of just cutting it off. They have to make a case before the Ontario Energy Board, so that the government, and the board, does have the opportunity to hear precisely what arrangements they have made. And they will pass that de-

cision then. But it's not a carte blanche approval.

With regard to the Sandbanks, let me say that I think we are most fortunate to have been able to call on Dr. Tovell of the Royal Ontario Museum to conduct an in-depth study, with regard to the Sandbanks problem. As you know, Dr. Tovell is a noted conservationist, a naturalist and a geologist on top of that so he has all the requirements to do a study of the magnitude and the depth that we will require.

I can't say how long he has been on the site. I know he has been there. I know he has visited the area on many occasions. He has met with local people. He has examined the whole situation and, hopefully, he will have a report to me in a matter of the next few weeks. He has assured me that he is moving ahead quite rapidly on it. But I have no indication as to what he will recommend, of course, and where his studies stand at the present moment.

He is looking into the possibility of an alternate site; the chemical analysis of the sand in question, of course, in the manufacture of cement will be undertaken; the amount of sand that has been taken out, and the amount of sand under the lease agreement that is left, will be considered.

The whole aspects of the ecology, the environment and its relationship to the provincial park—that area will be considered in his report. So until his report is delivered to me, and his recommendations are considered, there is very little further than I can add.

Mr. Deans: It always worries me because we seem to have delayed, unnecessarily, the investigation into the effects of the quarry operations at the Sandbanks. I am always concerned when I read in the newspaper, as I have done on a number of occasions—

An hon. member: No doubt.

Mr. Deans: —reports supposedly made by citizens of the area that the operations of the company there are being stepped up in order to facilitate their future needs. The statement that worries me most, or had worried me most, is the statement which is now almost two months old and appeared in the Toronto Star on March 10, 1972, in which the minister was quoted as saying: "We will be testing sites as soon as the frost goes." It says: "Bernier told the Star: 'We could have it settled in weeks'."

Today, of course, we're told that we could have it settled in weeks. Perhaps, by the end of this session we could have it settled in weeks. And maybe by the start of next session it could be weeks. And it always concerns me that nothing ever seems to be conclusive. That there is never any definite programme set out that the minister is made aware of. Such as: This is what we are going to do. The results of that will be known to you in two, three, four weeks' time, whatever it is. And at that point a decision will be made.

Now, in the same article of March 10, a lady is quoted as saying: "The pile of sand in the company's yard near Picton is bigger now than the dunes by the bleak shore." Well, I suspect that that might be just slightly exaggerated, just slightly. But nevertheless, even if it were slightly exaggerated, even if it were grossly exaggerated, it still paints a pretty bleak picture of the future.

And if, in fact, the company is carrying on a day and night operation, moving the sand from the shore location to areas where it can be stockpiled, it is the kind of thing that ought to have been stopped. I don't mean stopping them entirely from operating, though that may well be the final result. In fairness to them, we ought to have been absolutely sure that the company wasn't taking more during that period than it averaged at any other time—that, in fact, it wasn't stockpiling for fear that government action may inhibit future operations in some way. I want to ask the minister whether that has been done. I think that this is important and I'd like to know how it was done.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, we did hear accusations along these lines, that there were extra trucks put on and they were travelling 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and this type of thing and we did an investigation on it. At one point there were half-load regulations to go into effect when they applied extra vehicles and that was the only indication.

From the reports that we have had from our inspectors, they had a no larger stockpile this year than they had any other year and, also, they keep a current inventory of this sand on the site, so that, while there have been some accusations that they were accelerating the removal, we feel that they did not.

Mr. Deans: Well, I am sure that with that kind of a report would come statistics. I'd like to ask the minister if he's in a position to provide us with the figures showing, let's say, the last four years of operation during

the period October to March, which is generally the period that includes the half-load season. We could then determine for the benefit of all the members just exactly how much has been taken out in any given year during that period and how much is, in fact, being stockpiled, and whether or not the allegations, which I am positive, were made in good faith by the people who live in the area, have some basis in fact.

I would hope, in fact, I'd be positive, that the inspector, if he carries on any kind of week-to-week investigation, or overseeing function, would have some statistics available from his perusal of the company's records, if nothing else, to provide to this House so that we could satisfy ourselves as well as the minister satisfying himself that there is no factual basis for the things that we hear.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I can only tell the hon. member that Dr. Hewitt, who is regarded as an expert in this particular field, reported to me that the company report to the department on the quantity of their sand removal on a yearly basis, and his investigation—his periodic investigation when the issue arose and his constant investigation—has satisfied him that there was no acceleration of the removal of sand. So I have to accept that. There is no daily record kept by the department on the number of loads and number of yards.

Mr. Deans: Yes, well, but there must be—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You might ask if it is a guestimate or an eyeball figure, but these fellows are experts in their field.

Mr. Deans: No, no. It is not a guestimate at all. I'm quite sure the company has a record of every truckload of sand that is taken from there, they must have.

Mr. Stokes: They have to pay for it; there would have to be a record.

Mr. Deans: To begin with, they have to pay, so there has to be a pretty clear indication of how much was taken, on the basis of how much they paid. Secondly, there must be a clear indication in the records, not only of the company but of the department, of how much sand by the ton has been taken in any given year. If that is available, then that would probably go a long way towards relieving us of some of the fears that we have. Would you be able to make that available?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We can get you those yearly figures. No problem there at all; no problem.

Mr. Deans: Good, we would expect to have them this evening, would we? Or—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I don't say you'll get them this evening, but we'll make sure you get them—

Mr. Deans: You will make sure we'll get them before the estimates are over, right?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, I won't guarantee that.

Mr. Deans: You won't guarantee that either, eh? What kind of guarantee is it we're getting—that some day we'll hear about it?

Mr. Stokes: Weeks.

Mr. Deans: Well, fair enough. Did you want to say something? You want to say something now, because I have more but it—

An hon. member: I am waiting for just before 6.

Mr. Deans: You are waiting for just before 6? Okay. Fine.

Mr. Chairman: No, carry on.

Mr. Deans: I am kind of interested in the amount of money that we will recover from the use of what are listed in the statistical part of the annual report of the Ontario Department of Mines, under structural materials, which falls very nicely inside—

An hon. member: Non-renewable resources.

Mr. Deans: Non-renewable resources. I can assure you, just before you go dancing off into the wilderness—

Mr. Chairman: I think it was your imagination.

Mr. Deans: You don't have to, because we are going to talk about sand and gravel and stone and lime and cement for a little while, and just a little bit about what goes on.

Mr. Chairman: You don't need to explain.

Mr. Deans: The amount of money that is levied or considered to be the appropriate worth of the total structural materials taken out of the ground in 1969, was $170,136,449.

And that, all but $31,482,000, was for a total of 92,460,000 odd tons of cement, lime, sand and gravel, and stone.

My understanding of the returns to the Province of Ontario for the use of this rather extensive amount was a figure quoted in the Toronto Telegram on July 15, 1971, of $108,-677. Would that figure be somewhat close to being accurate? That is the royalties for sand and gravel that brought in $108,677.

Mr. Good: For tonnage, charges and rehabilitation.

Mr. Deans: No, no. That is a different thing.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. member would not mind, if he is agreeable—

Mr. Deans: I would be pleased to—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for St. George has a statement he would like to make in correction of an earlier statement he made.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, if I may, it must surely be made—it can't be made to the committee, it must be made to the House.

Hon. Mr. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Chairman, I find that I inadvertently misled the House today during question period and I wanted to correct it at the very earliest opportunity. I really didn't believe that it made very much difference whether it is said before committee or before the House as a whole.

Mr. Deans: I think it should be made before the House.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) today was asking me some questions relating to a gentleman who is employed as an assistant part-time Crown attorney in the Ottawa Valley area. When he inquired of me earlier this afternoon as to the status of this gentleman, I indicated to him that such persons were not brought within the provision of section 12 of the Public Service Act.

I advised him to this effect because, quite frankly, the usual part-time assistant Crown attorney is not a Crown employee within the meaning of the Public Service Act, as these persons are usually appointed under the Crown Attorneys Act and therefore do not become Crown employees.

Also, earlier in the week I indicated that as a result of other inquiries relating to the termination of the services of Mr. Paul Dick, I was launching an inquiry and an investigation into the whole question of these employees under that Act. And in the course of my investigation this afternoon of those employees in the Justice field, I have discovered that, in a few cases where it is necessary and where it is appropriate for a part-time assistant to be paid an annual retainer for reasons of economy, then an appointment may be made by a minister's order under the Public Service Act. In such a case, the person would be a Crown employee.

I earlier had been advised by my advisers that the gentleman about whom the hon. member enquired was a part-time Crown attorney, but I had not then been advised that he had also been appointed by the then minister under the Public Service Act.

As I say, I think this is a fairly important matter as it relates to the individual inquired of this afternoon. And, therefore, at the very earliest opportunity, I wanted to correct the record and correct my inadvertent misleading of the House.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): You are doing that quite often.

Mr. Deans: Not to engage in debate, would the minister then be prepared to make a further statement tomorrow, perhaps, relating to the question asked by the leader of the NDP with regards to the status of the—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, I think I—

Mr. Deans: —the employee now that his legal position has been cleared up?

Mr. Chairman: It being now 6 o'clock, the chairman will leave the chair until 8 o'clock, p.m.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 18, 1972

Sale of Ontario tobacco to China, statement by Mr. Stewart 2553

Extension of employment incentive programme, statement by Mr. Grossman 2553

Report on non-medical use of drugs, statement by Mr. Welch 2554

Grants for educational research, statement by Mr. Wells 2554

Sulphur dioxide control programme, statement by Mr. Auld 2554

Report on non-medical use of drugs, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Sargent 2555

Extension of employment incentive programme, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis 2555

WCB retirements, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 2556

OHC purchase of Hydro land, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deacon 2557

Languages of instruction in schools, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Bullbrook 2558

Political activity by assistant Crown attorney, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Lewis 2559

Sugar beet industry, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Spence 2560

Allegation of man being charged under false name, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence and Mr. Bales: Mr. Shulman 2560

Use of assessment computer tapes, questions of Mr. McKeough and Mr. Grossman: Mr. Gaunt 2561

Tobermory ferry service, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Sargent 2561

Inco working conditions, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Laughren 2561

Metro Toronto incinerator, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Deacon 2562

Native population parkland rights, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Stokes 2562

Windsor senior citizens' housing, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. B. Newman 2562

Junior Forest Ranger programme, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Foulds 2564

Sex research in schools, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Sargent, Mr. Foulds 2564

Assistance to municipalities for nutrient removal, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Edighoffer 2565

Becker Milk Co., questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Deans 2565

Wolf bounty, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Burr, Mr. Reid, Mr. Sargent 2565

Presenting annual reports, municipal affairs, municipal financial, food terminal board, Mr. Snow 2566

Charitable Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading 2566

Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading 2566

Game and Fish Act, bill to amend, Mr. Drea, first reading 2566

Champerty and Maintenance Abolition Act, bill to abolish, Mr. Lawlor, first reading 2566

Pyramidic Sales, bill to control, reported 2566

Estimates, Ministry of Natural Resources, Mr. Bernier, continued 2584

Political activity by assistant Crown attorney, statement by Mr. A. F. Lawrence 2599

Recess, 6 o'clock 2599

No. 66

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, May 18, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1972

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES
(*concluded*)

On vote 1805:

Mr. Chairman: The member for York West (Mr. MacBeth) wishes to introduce his guests.

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): Mr. Chairman, just before you get under way for the evening's proceedings, I would like to draw the House's attention to the east gallery where you will find some good visitors from the beautiful riding of York West who are with us here tonight.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Do they belong to any particular organization out there?

Mr. MacBeth: No particular organization.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1805:

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Carried!

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Carried? Now there is a man with a sense of humour!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It seems to me it was carried, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: Yes, it seems to you it was carried.

I want to ask the minister how you justify receiving only $108,000 from something valued, by your own evaluation, at $170 million plus? How do you rationalize that return to the province in terms of royalties—anid I realize there are other payments, but in terms of royalties, which is the basic payment to the province for the use of the substances—out of that kind of a value?

As far as I am concerned, from my own personal point of view, the return that we get for a non-renewable resource is far too small to be countenanced. I would like to hear from the minister how he can possibly go along with that.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Chairman, the figure to which the member is making reference should read, for the year 1971, $122,173.52.

Mr. Deans: One hundred and twenty-two—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Thousand. Just to correct you on that figure. And I would point out to you that the figure to which he refers is the overall aggregate production figure in value in Ontario.

Mr. Deans: Yes, right!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And the other figure that he refers to, the $122,000, is the royalty that is collected from sand suckers in the Great Lakes. There is no royalty collected from the private lands in southern Ontario to which the mineral rights were granted several years ago.

Mr. Deans: What is the method of computing the returns to the province on the use of non-renewable resources from other than Crown land? What is the method of computing the return from those?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is the input to the economy. This is the overall job picture and the contribution that aggregate makes to the general economy.

Mr. Deans: Does the minister think it right that a person should be able to take the resources of the province, whether they be on land owned by them or on land owned by the Crown, and use them without paying for them, without in fact actually purchasing them? Doesn't the minister feel that the resources of the province are in fact the responsibility of and belong to the province as a whole and that if people want to make use of those that they ought to purchase them from the Crown, whether or not the land in which they are located belonged to the individual or not?

Mr. Chairman: I might point out to the hon. member that this would have more properly been on the first vote rather than this one, because we are talking about development of resource programmes.

Mr. Deans: We are talking about—I am sorry, what?

Mr. Chairman: You are talking about the annual report; this is the resource development programme.

Mr. Deans: Yes I know, but Mr. Chairman, if I may, we are talking about non-renewable resources and the use to which they are put and the return to the province of Ontario for the—

Mr. Chairman: The development of those resources, though, I might point out, is this vote. It might have been properly brought up under the first vote, which would have been general—

Mr. Deans: You mean under the first item of the vote?

Mr. Chairman: No, the first vote of the department's estimates.

Mr. Deans: The first vote of the estimates?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, because it was in general administration.

Mr. Deans: No, no; I am talking specifically about the non-renewable resources—that is what we are talking about in this vote—and the amount of money which we receive for the sale of the non-renewable resources in the Province of Ontario. That surely comes under 1805. Vote 1805 is entitled "Non-Renewable Resource Development Programme."

Mr. Chairman: Right, but you are both talking about an existing situation.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): And there is a programme description right there.

Mr. Deans: I am talking about—it says, "the programme consists of activities which encourage and regulate the development of the province's non-renewable resources."

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but you are talking about the report.

Mr. Deans: I am just referring to the report. The report of course carries on. Next year we will be talking about last year's report. I agree it is not up to date. But I am frankly concerned that we believe that we recover sufficient, just simply by way of the general economy benefit, from the sale and use of the non-renewable resources in the Province of Ontario.

I frankly believe that the resources of the Province of Ontario belong to the people of the province and that if a person wants to use them, so be it. But I believe there has to be a direct return to the coffers of the province for the use of those resources. I hold that the only way we can to some extent regulate the use, and regulate the economy of the province is if we do have some control over the use to which resources can be put and the return we can expect for the Province of Ontario.

I suggest to the minister that the method used in recovering financial gain from the sale and use of non-renewable resources is archaic. This used to be the way in which they operated in every level, manufacturing and everything. Where you hope to gain sufficient from the expenditures of the employees, and from the indirect benefit that flowed from the use of the product, to operate the country and to replace the resources as they were depleted. What we find here, in my opinion, is that unless we recover a reasonable sum of money for the sale of those resources, then we don't have sufficient from that sale to encourage and develop any other kind of industrial endeavour that will some day take the place of that resource as a means of employment and a means of economic stimulus, if and when the resource becomes depleted.

I believe that we have to recover sufficient from those resources in order that we can put the money back into those particular economies in which the resource was located, in order that we can develop the kind of secondary industry and other forms of employment—making endeavours, so that at some point we can offer to the people in those communities an opportunity for the future.

And we are not doing that right now. By simply saying that we benefit in the total economy from making these things available at no cost, we find that there is no money being levied directly to us from that; and we find that, in fact, we are losing a great source of revenue. Maybe not a large source in any one year, but a sufficiently large source to justify getting it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: I don't know. It would give a fair chunk. It doesn't matter. The amount isn't as important as the principle. And the principle of just simply giving away the resource is in my opinion a completely wrong principle.

I suggest to the minister that you ought

to extend what you now do in the Crown land sector to other areas. You've got to exercise jurisdiction over resources of the province. If we are going to benefit, as my colleague from the north and Thunder Bay has often spoken about, if we are going to be able to benefit in this province from the resources, which in fact are the natural wealth of the Province of Ontario, then we are going to have to recover directly from the sale of those resources to the persons who are going to use them in the first instance. I say to the minister that I can't accept the proposition that this government puts forward.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I am motivated to make a few comments on this particular vote. I am motivated by a couple of citations that the then Department of Mines received in the report of the Provincial Auditor dated 1970-71. And we all know that the Provincial Auditor is not particularly prone to pointing the finger at any discrepancies in any department. So that whenever there is even an oblique reference in the Provincial Auditor's report. I think it is worthy of our consideration.

It has to do with collecting royalties at the pithead, wherein the Provincial Auditor did cite a weakness in the system in that the assessor has too much prerogative in determining what methods were used to define the pithead value of the metals extracted.

The Provincial Auditor states in his report to the ministry that matters of this nature should be set out in the Act or regulations so that taxpayers and other interested persons may obtain knowledge of policy rates and conditions by reference to public documentation. It appears that the section of the Mining Act relative to assessing pithead value is quite weak. When you leave the onus in determining the value of metals produced up to one person, when he has the prerogative of determining his method whereby he will evaluate pithead value, then I think we are putting too much responsibility on one assessor.

The Provincial Auditor does recommend that these regulations should be set out so that in fact the public of Ontario will get even this miniscule amount of revenue which we are getting from the mining corporations. We will at least be guaranteed of this. It is a small enough amount, but I think we should really go after it. I would like to know if the minister is contemplating taking the corrective action as cited by the Provincial Auditor.

There is another problem as far as collecting pithead revenues on a royalty basis: Very often during the development stage a mining company, when doing their development work, will have a large work force in there and it takes two or three years to do the development work. At some stage of time this mine must go from the development stage into the production stage. It is at this point that the royalties are levied and the value extracted. But the mining companies, I know from experience, are reluctant to declare at any one particular time when we have moved from the development stage into the productive stage. In some instances the mining branch has to come in and make such a declaration.

I do know the mining companies have been getting away with periods of time when their pithead production is not being evaluated by the mining assessor because they have not declared themselves as having been in production. They are escaping even this minimal amount of tax. So I wonder if the minister has considered tightening up on the assessment of royalties at the pithead to make sure the people of Ontario get the full value as dictated by law.

Now the second citation that the mines department received from the Provincial Auditor had to do with security deposits as put up by oil and gas pipeline companies. To give the minister an idea, just in case he has forgotten what the Auditor said, these deposits consisted of government of Canada 3 per cent perpetual bonds which were accepted at face value of $69,000 for security requirements of $67,950, although the market value was approximately $29,000 when lodged. On forfeiture of the deposits, the proceeds from the sale of these bonds fell some $40,000 short of requirements.

I don't know under just what circumstances you take security deposits, but certainly it is not much security when the security is forfeited and the Province of Ontario suffers a net loss of $40,000. I am sure the department must have people on staff well qualified to evaluate the security deposits. I would wonder again if the minister is considering tightening up in this field so that security deposits don't just end up being a piece of paper and hardly worth the value of the paper that they are written on.

I would like to pursue one other area

which was pursued by the member for Wentworth when he was talking of the value of structural materials extracted from the ground, and what benefits the province really derives from this depleting resource. I know that we try to take into consideration that the wages paid for extracting this wealth is in some way supposed to keep this community viable. Now we know that this is not true, and this is one of the weaknesses in the economy throughout northern Ontario, that we do for the most part rely on extraction of metals.

In the annual statistical review we see that the total value of metal production in Ontario for the year 1970 was $1.392 billion. Now we received total provincial revenues from this $1.392 billion, of only $27 million. Which is a miniscule amount to demand for extraction of this wealth. Because we know that every ton that we extract from the ground is one ton closer to the last ton, and each of these towns in turn will have to turn into a ghost mining town.

This is precisely what I have seen in northern Ontario throughout my life and, as the member for Wentworth says, we have to extract from this depleting resource enough wealth to create a secondary industry so that this community will not necessarily die when this ore body runs out. In the past we certainly haven't taken this precaution.

We have seen what has happened in the gold belt. When the bottom fell out of that, these mining towns just sank down into the ground. I think that a whole new policy has to be developed by this ministry to ensure there is enough money extracted from this wealth so that a viable community can be left in its stead after these deposits are depleted.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well Mr. Chairman, I'll comment briefly on the member's remarks. I would say to him, with regard to the mine assessor's operations, I'm sure he is aware that the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has already made an announcement that the whole matter of mine revenue taxes and resource taxes is undergoing a very intensive and thorough review. So we can expect in the period ahead that there will be some changes in this particular approach.

With regard to the report of the Provincial Auditor, I would have to say to him that I am very much aware of the Auditor's report and certainly we are aware; and have taken note of his comments as they apply to the mine tax and as they apply to certain guarantees and bonds that are placed with us as security. I would point out to him further that, while we did accept the government of Canada perpetual bonds, this is not the case any longer, because of the problem that the Auditor brought to our attention. In this particular case which the Auditor refers to, the department did foreclose ahead of time and confiscated the bonds in question. So there was actually no direct financial loss to the province. They did not live up to their end of the exploration agreement, so we foreclosed. So there was no real direct loss.

Now with regard to the tax, as I pointed out to the member for Wentworth, the return to us on a commodity that is so abundant as aggregate is brought to us in an indirect manner, particularly in southern Ontario where the mineral rights were granted to these private properties several years ago.

But in northern Ontario, where we have jurisdiction and control, of course we do collect the royalty on Crown lands—and what I mentioned was $122,000 last year, that figure should be $222,000—from the Great Lakes and sandsuckers; and this includes the aggregate taken from Crown lands. So there is a return. When you look at the overall picture of gravel pits, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto where at one time over the years we had 60 known gravel pits, I defy you today to find those gravel pits. The earth is levelled off. The property has been redeveloped and put to good use so that there is no real loss to that particular property or that particular site. Certainly the earth and aggregate is taken from here and put over there in the form of some development.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I can show you 14,000 of them.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: But the benefit is certainly there to the people of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: By your own figures.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, in this vote we have a request for—they might pass you know—$5 million for access to resources, and $4 million for geological services and shared exploration costs.

The way of getting into these places is by aircraft, and I am very concerned about the fact that we have a purchase in the estimates for an aircraft from Field Aviation for $488,000.

The thing I am concerned about, Mr. Chairman: I'd like to ask the minister when you decided to purchase an aircraft, in view of the game of musical chairs played in this department. I know the minister is a new man on the job, but who makes the decision to buy an aircraft for $500,000 dollars?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well this is a matter that is taken before Management Board.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Management Board would decide this, on our recommendation.

Mr. Sargent: So how many aircraft do you have now in your total fleet?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I believe that this particular matter should have been under another vote.

Mr. Sargent: I knew that was coming. I realized that this could happen, because we have in your estimates, to give you right now, $4 million, access to resources, and number 3, geological services, about $4 million; and the only way you are going to get this is through aircraft.

Mr. Chairman: It is for access road purposes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Access road purposes!

Mr. Sargent: Well you don't understand—

Mr. Chairman: I'm afraid that unless you can relate it to access roads—

Mr. Sargent: The fact is that you can't do geological services through roads—you know that.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Sargent, unless you can relate it to access roads—and how you are going to do that with aircraft I don't know.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, we'll go to item 3, geological services. Mr. Chairman, we are doing business with 35 different air services in the estimates; I have them in front of me. And I'll read them all to you if you want to qualify it. We are doing business with 35 air services in the estimates.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Take it as read.

Mr. Sargent: Take it as read, thank you. You're the whip. You're helping the Chairman are you? He needs help, I tell you.

This minister has 37 different aircraft of the "Davis air force"—

Mr. Chairman: I must tell the hon. member that that is not under discussion in this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Oh come on now, Mr. Chairman! We're talking about the expenditure of $4 million to get to geological surveys and to services. So how are you going to do it if you are not going to use aircraft?

Mr. Chairman: That is not under this vote. It is access roads, $4 million.

Mr. Sargent: Well you tell me—I will name the firms off to you and the accounts if you want to start.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I realize you have the list of accounts, but you must relate it to access roads—the $4 million you are talking about.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking to item 3, or what vote are you on?

Mr. Chairman: If you can relate it to aircraft on that vote you go ahead, but I would like to hear how.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, I'll try to. So we have, Mr. Chairman, the area which nobody has more knowledge about than the minister, because he is a very qualified bush pilot. He is equipped to fly instruments on wheels, on floats, and you name it, on skis.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Who? Leo?

Mr. Sargent: Leo, the minister; yes. He is a very able pilot. He knows what I am talking about; and I know a bit of what he is talking about too. This man has more aircraft at his command than a general in Vietnam or some guy with a patch over his eye in Israel.

Here we are, you are asking us to say you can justify the expense of God knows how many millions of dollars for the 37 aircraft you have, and God knows how many pilots you have who do nothing—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think I should straighten the member out on this particular–

Mr. Sargent: No, the minister can't get up. I want to ask him how he can justify the fleet he has, the air force he has and the audacity he has to tell the taxpayers of Ontario that he needs that fleet, that air force to serve him–

Mr. Chairman: I want to call the member to order–

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman!

Mr. Chairman: I will call you to order–

Mr. Sargent: And to ask us to pay for 35 air services on top of it!

Mr. Chairman: It is not under this vote, sir.

Mr. Sargent: It certainly is! How does the minister service $4 million worth of mining surveys, geological surveys–

Mr. Chairman: It was in a previous vote.

Mr. Sargent: It is so, I'm telling you under items 3.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It was when the member was out flying there.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South please.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, you are the only one who doesn't know what is going on.

Mr. Chairman: The member is out of order. I have given you an opportunity to relate your remarks to the matter under discussion and you have not done that. The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Sargent: I will explain it to you. We have–

Mr. Chairman: Would you resume your seat, please.

Mr. Sargent: We have 35 air trips here now, which you are using–

Mr. Chairman: Order! Resume your seat.

No, I am asking you to resume your seat. You have not related your remarks to the vote under discussion. I have given you the opportunity–

Mr. Sargent: Access to these resources!

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but you have not related it even to item 3, to which I gave you the opportunity to relate it. You did not do that; therefore I have to call you to order.

Mr. Sargent: I don't mind.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South. Order!

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I think what the member is really trying to say is that the contracts which are let for flying geological surveys–

Mr. Sargent: I can make my own speech.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I gave him that opportunity though, and he did not relate them. I am giving you the floor and you can make your remarks.

Mr. Ferrier: All right, I will gladly take the floor and speak about–

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you something. I am talking about millions of dollars–

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: You have no right to stop me. I can talk–

Mr. Chairman: You are out of order, and I will not–

Mr. Sargent: I am not out of order.

Mr. Chairman: I will not tell you again.

Mr. Sargent: I certainly am not and I challenge your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: I am calling you out of order.

Mr. Sargent: This amounts to 35 different air services for work he should do himself.

Mr. Chairman: Please! Order Take your seat, please.

I have given you the opportunity to relate your remarks to the vote under discussion. The matters you were raising were under a previous vote and you did not take the opportunity to give your remarks on those votes.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): He was in Miami.

Mr. Sargent: I was asking a question!

Mr. Chairman: I have given you far more latitude than I should have given you, but you did not relate them to this vote.

Mr. Sargent: I don't think you are very fair, but I will ask him a question.

Mr. Chairman: All right, you can ask him a question but it must be related to this vote.

Mr. Sargent: I will do that, sir. Will the minister tell me how he can do business with 35 different air services on top of what you have—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I will have to call on your colleague to give his points of view—

Mr. Sargent: —to do these geodetic surveys—

Mr. Chairman: I will not tolerate it any further. I have given you the opportunity, now you are abusing your privilege.

Mr. Sargent: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. Chairman: I do.

Mr. Sargent: You certainly don't.

Mr. MacDonald: That makes at least two if that is true.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, I hope that I can relate my remarks to the particular votes that are here.

There are two aspects that I want to talk about. I want to talk about exploration and development and I want to talk about access roads. Mr. Duncan R. Derry, consultant geologist with Derry, Michener and Booth, Toronto, says he expects Canadian exploration in 1972 to fall about 20 per cent from last year. He bases this estimate on a survey of spending intentions by 24 mining companies. He also notes:

> About 250 geologists and geophysicists are unemployed or working outside their professions, representing about 20 per cent of Canada's earth scientists previously employed by the mining industry. There is no point in blaming government action, federal or provincial, for all our troubles. There is little doubt the dominant factor for the downturn in exploration activity is the decrease in metal prices.

I think it is evident, if one looks at the figures, that there has been a decrease in the amount of money spent on exploration since 1964 in that famous Windfall episode. Before the regulations were stiffened, I understand the mining companies were spending about $40 million. By 1969, it dropped to $31 million and by 1971 the total was down to $29 million. So concerned were the prospectors and the developers that the theme of their meeting this year was: "Restrictions are killing our industry."

In an attempt to spur some exploration, the government has changed the securities regulations and has allowed the underwriters, I think, a larger underwriting fee and this kind of thing. There have been some changes there. Evidentally the government feels that this will stimulate to some degree the exploration in this province through their—I forget what it is called—it is a mineral exploration programme that you are doing in conjunction with mines in two or three areas of the province? You are pumping some money in and doing it on a shared basis with some of these mining companies.

The chairman of the Hollinger Mines made a statement to the 61st annual meeting. He used the old bogey that the taxation structure was the thing that was keeping them from doing exploration.

> The tax climate of Canada is leading Hollinger Mines Ltd. to turn some of their exploration activities to other nations, company president A. L. Fairley, junior, told the annual meeting. The 61st annual meeting of the company was held in Montreal recently. Hollinger operates an exploration office in Timmins although it has ceased all mining operations and is selling off its property. The Hollinger president said that the new tax laws enacted at the beginning of 1972 bear more heavily on the mineral industry than the laws they replaced, and that the Canadian tax structure as it now exists is less conducive to mining enterprise than the tax laws governing mining in a number of other major competitive mineral-producing countries. He added in the past that Hollinger and its associates had concentrated exploration activities in Canada, but the provisions of the present Canadian tax structure have made it desirable to direct some of this effort to other parts of the world, where tax laws provide more incentive for mining enterprise.

There is a man whose company has made its fortune out of the gold mines in Timmins. It has invested its money elsewhere and now it's saying, using an argument

which this Duncan R. Derry half shoots down, that because the federal government has changed its taxation structure to some degree they are not going to pump nearly as much money into exploration and mining activities in this country and in this province as they have previously.

We have seen also that since 1964 the mining companies in Ontario have pumped about $11 million less a year than had been put into the system before. One feels that these mining companies are asking for more and more privileges and they will go to whoever will give away their resources without expecting anything else back.

I think, in the interests of developing the north, this kind of big stick that is being wielded over the minister and the government is not in our best interests. I think the money you are pumping into exploration and development work in the Tritown and Kirkland Lake and Geraldton areas and so on might have some effect, but I think the approach that there has been in Quebec and the approach that has been adopted in Manitoba will have equally good effect.

I point to the Crown corporation that was set up in Manitoba, the Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd.

It is under a three-man board of directors, headed by a consulting geologist, Albert Koffman. It is laying plans for its first year of operation. The minister at the time, Sidney Green, and the NDP administration of Premier Ed Schreyer are not counting on immediate results.

> "What I do know is that in the long term, if people are prepared to be patient, minerals will be discovered," said Mr. Green. "Either someone will get rich or Manitobans will discover them and be a little better off than they are."

Although the government is open to and has received quite a few approaches from private companies for joint ventures, the resources minister describes the company as giving Manitobans an alternative way of getting more benefits from its mineral resources.

> We are continually being told by private industry that if we try to increase the share of the people through royalties, it will result in less activity on the part of the private companies in Manitoba. While the arguments were not without foundation, we are saying that we can't have the amount of returns that Manitobans will get from their mineral resources entirely at the will or discretion of the private companies.

I think that Mr. Green's statements are very valid, that we can't let the mining companies hold the big stick over us and say, "You have got to give it to us"—at such fantastic and unreasonable royalties, without getting sufficient tax revenue for the people, "and unless you do it our way, we won't play the game at all."

This is why I feel that we in Ontario should be prepared to set up a similar Crown corporation for exploration and development and do it alongside, if necessary, the exploration work that is being done by these companies. If an ore body is found and it is economical, let's develop some of these ourselves and let's compete with these companies. I think we will show that we can get far more back for the Treasury of the province in this way than these mining companies are giving us now through the present taxation structure. I think they will find that they are well off, and I suggest they might be prepared to spend more money on exploration than they have been in the last declining years.

I don't know, but I wouldn't be surprised if some of these smaller companies might just have enough drive that they might find something; but I don't think that is sufficient money to be pumped into exploration to justify the government doing little more than changing those regulations a little and putting some money in to assist exploration. I think that the government has got to get actively involved itself.

I know the minister will say we are free enterprisers and we don't believe in those socialist things and all that kind of stuff, but I think in terms of developing the north that involvement in this way, where you have government involvement along with private involvement, will be a much better approach to developing the north and that ore bodies will be discovered. There will be more money pumped into exploration, because I think it is evident that these big mining companies are very well off and they have made a great deal of money.

I could mention Texas Gulf and you will say that's one in a million, and this is very true, but it is probably the richest ore body outside of Sudbury in Ontario right now. At the same time, the taxation structure has been such that they have more than paid off, as I understand, any development and exploration costs and even the capital costs from their return.

I suggest that another way that we are going to have to encourage exploration and development in the north is increasingly through this access road programme. You are not going to open up these areas by airplanes but by actual roads.

I notice in the 1971-72 programme that $150,000 were set aside for a pre-engineering, pre-contract link between Timmins and Smooth Rock Falls.

I would like the minister, in replying to me, to say what that really means and what is involved in it, because I've been led to believe there hasn't been very much spent to open up that area from Smooth Rock Falls to Timmins by this kind of an access road, or by any other kind of road under the Department of Transportation and Communications. Perhaps he could clarify that.

The next thing I would ask him to clarify is—now that there has been the reshuffling of the government, who are the members of the NORT committee? He might tell us the members.

The next item I want to discuss in connection with those roads is this road south of Timmins. I know that the minister has stated that Allied Asbestos is going to develop its road and it is going to go out to Matachewan and Kirkland Lake. That's fine and dandy. I'm quite prepared to live with that. The reason that Timmins was all uptight about it was that about two or three days before the election Wilf Spooner realized that he was in great trouble; so in conjunction with the mining company, he announced that there was this big ore body there and tried to con the people into voting for him and led the people of Timmins to believe that we should be involved in that development.

Mr. Deans: Wilf who?

Mr. Ferrier: An approach like this leads—

Mr. Deans: Who is that fellow?

Mr. Ferrier: —almost to a rivalry between communities, because each community is in such a precarious position that it tries to outdo the other in getting access to an ore body. I think that kind of policy is an invidious policy. I'm quite prepared to live with that decision, but I do believe that road south from Timmins, that is partially developed now, must be completed sometime in the not-too-distant future.

When Highway 144 was built to Sudbury, the route taken was one to the west of Timmins. It goes through an area that is not specifically significant from a geological point of view. The thinking is that if ores are to be found they will be found in mainly volcanic and sedimentary rocks. Most of the known mineral deposits occur in this rock assembly.

There is a map in the Design for Development: Northeastern Ontario region report. The road that I am talking about will go through these volcanic and sedimentary rocks. Highway 144 that goes down to Sudbury was directed through mainly granitic rocks, and evidently the chances of finding ore bodies there is much less. So in terms of opening up and developing a section for mineral development, that Highway 144 to Sudbury was not as significant as it might have been. Had the route been chosen that went directly south from Timmins to link with Capreol, it would have gone through mainly volcanic and sedimentary rock.

This is the area where we are talking about right now, the Papakomeka road as it is known. That area is rich in lumbering. Right now there are lumber companies cutting and hauling logs out of there. Ontario Hydro is there working on a dam and, also the former Department of Lands and Forests, the minister's own department, is involved in that area.

I know the minister said that it didn't have too high a priority as far as the spending of moneys was concerned. I think that his thinking was that all we were interested in getting that road open for was so we could get access to Allied Asbestos. This isn't our thinking at all. We are quite prepared to let it go the other way and let Kirkland Lake have an economic infusion into its area. But we do feel that before too long—even if it is after the mine is developed—in terms of the potential that is there, that this road should be continued and opened. It would also open a whole section from Elk Lake down through to New Liskeard, and it would be an alternative route.

I would suspect that there are going to be other mineral deposits found in that general area and I think that this would be a way of opening the possibility of those kind of developments. So I hope the minister and his colleagues have not written off that whole proposal by saying it's just greedy fellows trying to swing something away from another area. This isn't the thinking of the mayor and the members of the committee and myself at all. I'll admit at the first stage it was my thinking, but I have changed it

and I'm quite prepared to think less on a parochial basis and more on a regional basis. So I hope that they will give consideration to that.

I'd like to have the minister's comment also on that Smooth Rock Falls section. Previously I thought that it was left dormant, but when I saw in the second last page of the report that $150,000 had been set aside I became very interested. I would like to have a report on what has been done and what is proposed and the route that this work is being done on.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment briefly on the remarks of the member for Owen Sound. I do believe I should explain to him—I'm sorry he is not here. I could elaborate in detail on his reference to the aircraft used in this particular vote. They are extremely minimal, because the only aircraft used in the geological services to which he referred is the engagement of a helicopter survey that this year will take place in the Pickle Lake Area. We will cover—

Mr. Haggerty: He will be back.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —will cover about 20,000 square miles this year in that particular area with a total cost of around $54,000 for the helicopter service. So that is the only aircraft in this particular vote. But there will be other transportation costs going back and forth to the other 31 geological parties that are established in northwestern Ontario.

In this vote is included the $1 million dollar mineral assistance programme which the member for Cochrane South so pleasantly referred to. Concerning the old cliché and the old song about Crown corporations we've heard so many times, I would just point out to the member for Cochrane South that while the Province of Quebec has made an effort in this connection, they have been engaged some seven years in the Crown corporation to which he refers. They have been spending an average of $1.5 million a year and have yet to receive one dividend. One good hopeful showing has yet to come to their attention.

Mr. Stokes: That's in the riding of Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes it is.

Mr. Ferrier: Great member in that riding too.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think that too often we forget the amount of dollars that go into exploration. We had Texas Gulf looking in that particular area for six years and spending $12 million. South Bay Selection Trust developed a mine at Uchie Lake—they were looking for some 10 years and their expenditure was close to $14 million.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): What did you say Texas Gulf spent?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Approximately $12 million.

Mr. Shulman: Before they made the discovery?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, before they made the discovery.

Mr. Shulman: Hogwash!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, I mean that. That happens—

Mr. Shulman: It isn't true.

Mr. Ferrier: They haven't spent $10 million yet.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: But you say to us to go into the exploration business. Well as I said earlier this afternoon, the Province of Ontario does lead every province in Canada with exploration dollars. We are the leaders and we are the forerunners. Other provinces are following our example. The mineral assistance programme that we initiated last September added further to the exploration dollars that are being spent right here in the Province of Ontario. So we are the leaders. We don't have to go backwards—

Mr. Stokes: You just started that programme last year and it was on our insistence that you did it.

Mr. Ferrier: You can do better, you can do even better if you get involved.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We don't have to go backwards, we are going ahead. We are going ahead and the rest are following us, so we are not taking a step backward in that particular regard. You will see by the additional dollars that are pumped into this particular vote this year that we realize exploration and geological services are the real nuts and bolts of the mining industry.

We have got to get the information out to the mining companies, we must be able to have the information at our fingertips, and we must gather it with our geological

services and our various programmes throughout the entire province. This is one of the reasons the Province of Ontario leads the other provinces: We have always put the emphasis on geological services, and it is showing up today by placing us as a leader in mineral exploration.

With regard to the NORT committee, this committee has been reconstituted, the chairman being the Minister of Natural Resources and the vice-chairman being the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton). On the committee will be the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) and the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle), who has a tremendous knowledge of the operations of this particular committee, and of course brings with him the northern flavour that is required, because the terms of reference say that these funds are to be spent north of the French River. With his knowledge of that particular area, of course, he is a very valuable asset.

Mr. Ferrier: What about the Smooth Rock Falls road?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh yes, we did budget $150,000 last year for a feasibility study and engineering report on the road between Timmins and Smooth Rock Falls. We spent $43,734.24 on that engineering study, and the initial report was not that encouraging in view of the fact—and I think I said this to the hon. member earlier—that this particular road did not hold a high priority in our programme. The information is there, and as it increases in priority, of course, the project will go ahead at what we think is the proper time. But at this point in time, with a reduction in our expenditures this year, I regret that I cannot give him any encouragement with regard to the development of that particular road at this time.

As for the construction of a road south of Timmins to the Texmont road and continuation of that particular road down to the Allied Mining asbestos discovery, this is something the committee gave very careful consideration to. And in discussions with the Allied Mining company, it was their strong desire—because they will be paying a portion of that road out of their funds; they'll be sharing the cost with us—they insisted that the best route to follow was the one to Matachewan; it would come out to Kirkland Lake, and of course would provide the Ontario northland with extra revenue.

This road will go ahead when we have received some formal application from Allied Mining. We have just received notice from them in a formal way that their preliminary reports and their studies indicated that this is the direction they will follow. So we have agreed to that.

Certainly the comment of the member for Cochrane South that the geology is good in the other direction is something we will bear in mind and examine very carefully, because there is no doubt in my mind that the road will eventually be connected. It's a natural when you look at the map. He has my assurance that we will keep a very close and watchful eye on the developments that occur in that particular area, because we are anxious to assist the mining developments as much as we can.

I think that pretty well covers the points that were raised. If there is something I've forgotten—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have one point that I am going to comment about briefly, and then I would like to have some information on another area of the minister's department.

The first point I want to comment on is: Will the minister again take under serious consideration giving up the administration of the Mining Tax Act in his department and transfer it, along with those experts in his department in that field, to the Ministry of Revenue? It seems to me that it puts the minister in an ambivalent position to be engaged in the expansion and development of the mineral resource industry in the province on the one hand, and to be charged also with the responsibility of collecting the taxes that are imposed on that industry, or a portion of the taxes imposed.

We now have, and have had for two years, a Minister of Revenue specifically charged with the collection of taxes. It appears to me to make very good sense that this minister relinquish that part of it and the Minister of Revenue pick it up; together with the expert personnel from the minister's department who are familiar with that area.

However, I want to turn principally to—and I haven't had the privilege of being here throughout the whole of the minister's estimates; but it is my understanding that this matter has not been dealt with—and that is the provision for processing in Canada,

which is contained in section 113 of the Mining Act.

That is a pretty mandatory provision, to say that as a condition of every right with respect to minerals in Ontario they be refined in Canada; unless it can be shown that they have an order in council exempting them from that processing operation.

Now the latest figures which I have are ones we obtained, well exactly two years ago now by coincidence. It was on May 19 in 1970 that we were last given the up-to-date information with respect to these exemptions. At that time it was shown clearly, the 12 major metallic minerals in the Province of Ontario that were mined here and the percentage of the output refined outside of Canada. The minister's predecessor gave us these percentage figures in 1970 of Ontario's output of these 12 major metallic minerals refined outside Canada.

In cadmium, 91 per cent; cobalt, 94.7 per cent; copper, 13.8 per cent; gold, 1 per cent; iron, 52.5 per cent; lead, 100 per cent; nickel, 43.1 per cent; platinum, 100 per cent; silver, 49.4 per cent; uranium, 50.6 per cent; zinc, 85.8 per cent.

Now the figures I am quoting from were with respect to refining. They were also figures which were made available at that time with respect to the earlier stage of smelting; but I am talking about refining because the section of the Mining Act deals with refining.

I notice in the minister's report there was a miniscule increase in employment in 1971 over 1970 in the mineral-resource industry of the province. As far as I can see, it was an increase of about 550 or 560 jobs.

I would like to know to what extent the government is carrying out the policy expressed in the Mining Act by obtaining from the minister the specific figures with respect to the percentages as of this date of Ontario's mineral output being refined outside of Canada. I would then like to deal with the question of the exempting orders in council as well. Perhaps I can have that information first of all?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems we are getting into some repetition here, because both of these matters to which you refer have been discussed by your party's critic of this particular department. We have gone into it but I will repeat again that the mining tax situation is something that the Provincial Treasurer has already said is under review within the government. The suggestion he has made is that they are going to examine it in detail, and hopefully we will have something by way of a major change within the period ahead. But the suggestion he has made is certainly something that—

Mr. Stokes: What are you recommending? A resource tax?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I wouldn't like to comment directly what we are looking at, but we are looking at a number of areas. I can assure you that.

With regard to section 113, and the exemption certificates, and also the member asked for the Ontario output of minerals refined outside of Canada. With a pencil, I could just give them to him. Copper, 14.1 per cent. These are 1970 figures, incidentally.

Mr. Renwick: Evidently these are the latest ones?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, these are the latest I have. The percentage of output of nickel we refine outside of Canada, 46 per cent; iron was 56.9 per cent; gold, 3.7 per cent; lead, 92 per cent; zinc, 88.9 per cent; and silver, 52.4 per cent.

Mr. Renwick: Uranium?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Uranium, I don't have. I am just informed that practically all is refined outside of Canada.

Mr. Renwick: Practically all the amount?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes. There is some minor quantity at Port Hope.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, this is what worries me. I don't know how to draw all the conclusions from the figures. But certainly on first flush, more of the major metallic minerals, as a percentage, are being processed outside of Canada than they were in 1968 before we passed the amendment. This I don't quite understand.

For example, if we just compare iron. It was 52.5 per cent in 1968, and in 1970 it's 56.9 per cent. And the figure which the minister gave that's illustrative enough. Zinc has gone up from 85.8 per cent to 88.9 per cent. Iron has gone up from 52.5 per cent to 56.9 per cent. Well maybe those figures aren't significant.

I think it clearly shows, however, that there are in existence exempting orders, which for practical purposes mean as we stand here now that there has been no sig-

nificant effect of the amendment which was passed by this Legislature in 1969 for the purpose of ensuring further processing by way of refining in Canada the mineral output of the Province of Ontario.

Now I would like to turn, if I may, to pursue this matter, Mr. Chairman. At the same time as those figures were given to us two years ago—two years ago tonight strangely enough—there were about 25 orders in council in existence for varying periods of time, with respect to the output of different companies and specific minerals. And there were explanations given at that time. I wonder is the minister able to give us in summary form all of the particulars of each of the orders in council presently exempting minerals, together with any recent orders in council which may have been given.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I believe I have placed on the record already the exemptions granted recently with regard to section 113. I could read them out again for the total.

Mr. Renwick: Are these all of them?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I have them all here.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if the minister has given us all of the presently outstanding orders in council with respect to these exemptions, and they are now in Hansard and on the record, I am not going to ask him to repeat them. If he hasn't done that, I want them on the record.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think I might have given you just this year's, the latest ones. I will repeat them again and put them all on the record again. Algoma Steel Corp. Ltd.; Keelendor Ltd.; Canadian Talc Industries Ltd.—

Mr. Renwick: Just a moment.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —or Canada Talc, I think it is.

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Consolidated Faraday; Dennison Mines; Hextall Mining Ltd., and there were three to Dennison Mines; Falconbridge Nickel Mines Ltd., and there was one for nickel and copper and another for iron, there were two there; Verminia Copper Ltd.; International Nickel, one for copper and nickel, another for iron, which makes two; Jones and Laughlin Mining Co. Ltd.; Kam-Kotia of Porcupine Mines Ltd.; Mattibi Mines Ltd.—

Mr. Stokes: That is the one we are talking about. How are you going—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: National Steel Corp. of Canada Ltd.; Rio Algom Mines Ltd., they have three; South Bay Mines Ltd.; Spanish Mines Ltd.; Steep Rock Iron Mines Ltd.; and Wilroy Mines Ltd. And then we have Copper Core—yes the rest are pretty well all named.

Mr. Renwick: Well I don't know whether that is complete. I am going to ask the minister if he would have a note to send to me, or to put as an appendix into the minutes of this meeting of this committee, a complete statement of each and every order in council with the date of its issue and particulars of the exemption granted, particularly the time limit in which it would be enforced.

I want to ask specifically about two of them. I assume that the minister can give that to me privately or by putting it on the record at some point. To make certain, I would ask him to refer to the Hansard of two years ago now—

Mr. Sargent: Can the minister answer my question yet?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I replied to you and you weren't here.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I replied and you weren't here.

Mr. Renwick: Page 2877 of the Hansard of May 19, 1970. If the minister could use that as a guide it would provide a comparative basis for those of us who want to follow along in a consistent way with the comparison.

I notice in the order in council which was granted to Falconbridge Nickel that it was an exemption with respect to nickel-copper concentrates and associated minerals during the period Jan. 1, 1970, to Dec. 31, 1975, with a provision by which the exemption may be terminated unless the company shows that it has contracted for, and/or commenced construction on, facilities in Canada by Dec. 31, 1972, for the refining of at least 51 per cent of the contained nickel and by-products from its Ontario ore.

Could the minister tell us whether or not he knows if, at this particular date, Falcon-

bridge is in a position to fulfil that commitment? If so, will it meet the date of Dec. 31, 1972? If not, is the minister in fact going to cancel the exemption as provided in the original order in council?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am informed that this was a commitment made by Falconbridge. Falconbridge has not been in touch with me concerning its commitment so I am just accepting the fact that it will be moving ahead with its commitment, because if it doesn't move ahead with its commitment, we will have to move ahead with our commitment.

Mr. Renwick: I want to emphasize then, because it would appear to me that, if the government is serious about it, the minister responsible on May 18, 1972, would have had some indication from Falconbridge whether or not it is going to commence construction on facilities by Dec. 31, 1972, for the refining of at least 51 per cent of its nickel and byproducts from its Ontario output.

I can't conceive that six or seven months before such a construction project there wouldn't be someone in the government who would know whether it was going to be done. I don't want anyone to misunderstand our position on the problem. It is not up to Falconbridge Nickel to come and ask an acquiescent government to grant them an extension of the exemption. The law says that the condition of their mining is that they refine in Canada. They have been given the privilege once and this, in my judgement, is an essential requirement for the development of our mining industry in this province and its proper processing.

The note showed that at that time the company at present had no facilities in Canada for refining its nickel or copper concentrates which are now refined at its plant in Norway. Rather than shut the operation down, an exemption has been granted, but it contains a provision that a refinery must be built in Canada or the exemption—in a typical government way—may be rescinded.

What is the minister's position? Does it mean what it says? Is he not going to extend the exemption if they do not commence operations by the end of this year?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have just been informed that Falconbridge has made an announcement. It is proceeding with the development in Quebec on the Seaway. This is its intention. I don't know at what phase or what stage the plans are but if this is the case then certainly it will have lived up to its commitment.

Mr. Renwick: It is 51 per cent of the output. I would assume, you know, if there was any initiative in the ministry about the importance of this, it would have been making inquiries and would be informed about the terms and conditions under which the exemptions were granted, and compliance by the granting company with the terms of those, rather than just sit back and wait until the mining industry comes to ask for an extension.

I want to say to the minister if it has not commenced on Dec. 31, on the intention of progressing in a normal, rapid development of those facilities, we will expect the minister to cancel that order and not to grant an extension of it.

The other one that I would like to ask about is in my colleague's riding, of course, and it may be that the answer has been given. That again was an exemption up to Dec. 31, 1972, and the company had agreed to have a zinc smelter and refinery complex in operation in the Timmins area, by the expiry of their present exemption, that will be capable of handling 51 per cent of the zinc concentrates. I would like to know whether or not it appears that Ecstall Mining Ltd. will be in a position to comply with that particular time limit.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I notice the member's colleague from Cochrane South is smiling. He is smiling because I guess he feels the member is not informed. The smelter is on stream now and certainly it will have lived up to its commitment. We will see a sharp decline in the percentage of zinc that will be refined outside of Canada after this production.

Mr. Renwick: When will it be expected that they will reach the target of 51 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This year.

Mr. Renwick: By the end of 1972; is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Correct!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, somewhere along the line, I think the Chair should establish the fact that—or appreciate the fact that

it is virtually impossible for every member of this House, the opposition, to be here at the exact time and place when an item is going to come up. He cannot always be here. It would be in the interest of the taxpayers of Ontario to discuss things; and I take great exception to the fact the Chair can immediately say, to protect the government, that no one can talk about that.

I say it, with all respect to the Chairman, as I know him. He is a completely fair man, and I respect him—and the other chairman, too. But it is completely wrong that we cannot say what we have to say on behalf of the taxpayers, because I am not here exactly when that thing comes up.

But regardless of that, I say that we should have a bit of leeway; because we are talking a lot of money and it is important to the taxpayers of Ontario. There is not a member of the 117 members in this House who doesn't come because he wants to do a job; and I say it because of you guys. All of us think we are going to upset the world and make things better for Ontario; and nothing happens because we have to protect this complete stupidity of a government. Mr. Chairman sits down there and says we will adhere to the vote and we can't ask these questions because it might embarrass the government; the Speaker included. If things get tough in the House, the Speaker says we will close the opposition off. My great leader, Bob Nixon, he has to suffer you guys. It makes you sick what goes on here.

Anyway, getting back to the point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: That's better.

Mr. Sargent: By asking if I may, Mr. Chairman, by permission of the Chair and by direction of the Chair—how can I get to the workings of how you operate this air force?—

Mr. Ferrier: Oh, that is it.

Mr. Sargent: —and I understand the minister gave a statement, under this vote of geological services of $3 or $4 million, that you have given it to one firm? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, one firm by tender. It is a helicopter service we use in the Pickle Lake area.

Mr. Sargent: Who's got the job?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Dominion Helicopter Services. They will do the airborne geological survey.

Mr. Sargent: Not down here; just in the north?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, they will be in the Pickle Lake area doing about 20,000 miles.

Mr. Sargent: What did you pay them last year?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This year it is around $54,000, I believe.

Mr. Sargent: How much?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It was $54,000 this year.

Mr. Sargent: You paid them $54,000 this last year and the Chairman has the audacity to say to me, Mr. Minister—if you are concerned about the rights of the departed member—he said: "You can't ask what is in the public accounts; that doesn't count."

Mr. Chairman: No. I said that the proper place to discuss public accounts is in the public accounts committee.

Mr. Sargent: But the only parallel, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: We are discussing the estimates—

Mr. Sargent: Yes we are, sir.

Mr. Chairman: —for the future expenditures, not the past.

Mr. Sargent: That is correct. So can we not use the public accounts to discuss the estimates, sir?

Mr. Chairman: If you can relate it to an expenditure.

Mr. Sargent: I sure as hell can. I can tell you that 35 firms, sir, spent millions of dollars last year in excess of the government's whole air force and on top of the air force the minister has.

Mr. Chairman: But that is not related to the vote we are talking about.

Mr. Sargent: I know it isn't. It is not.

Mr. Deans: But he has told you.

Mr. Sargent: So I want to know then how he can justify having 37 aircraft. And how many pilots, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Chairman: The member is now out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Sure, I'm out of order.

Mr. Chairman: But you are out of order because you are not relating it to the vote.

Mr. Sargent: Because I am starting to get embarrassing.

Mr. Chairman: No, you are not. It isn't that. You could have discussed it under two previous votes.

Mr. Deans: Of course he's embarrassing—

Mr. Chairman: He's embarrassing himself.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll put it to you: how should I ask the question?

An hon. member: You should have been here at the time it should be asked.

Mr. Chairman: You had a duty to be here at the time it came up for discussion. However, that is not the point. The point is that you should ask questions related to this expenditure proposed for this coming estimate, not the past.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much then, I appreciate your advice.

Now the minister says he is going to spend $54,000 with Dominion Helicopters.

Mr. Chairman: You are right on now.

Mr. Sargent: Right on target. You spent about $3 million last year with 35 different firms on the same type of operation. Now where is the balance of the money going? If you like, I'll read off the names of the firms to you to help you. You don't want that?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I must insist that this is not in this particular vote. I'm going to read out exactly what makes up this particular vote, because I know the member is a little confused. If he wants to put it down in writing, this is what we have. Activity administration—

Mr. Sargent: Look, one second; don't tell me I'm confused because I can tell you, sir, that you are a good pilot, but you know nothing about running that department, because you don't even run the department. The guys sitting in front of you tell you what to do and I am sick of that kind of nonsense. I think it is time that you ran the department, not the guys in front of you. Don't you tell me that.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I want to put on the record what makes up the $3,934,500 to which the member is constantly referring. This is the item that we are discussing at this particular time—activity administration, $186,100; geological surveys, $930,300.

Mr. Sargent: How much?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is $930,300.

Mr. Sargent: What firm?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This is not flying. This is geological services. There is no flying.

Mr. Sargent: I said what firm is doing it for you?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There are thirty-one parties in the field on geological surveys. We don't always go in the air.

Mr. Sargent: Most times you do, don't you?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They're on the ground, looking at geology. It is nothing to do with the engagement of 30 or 40 aircraft, nothing at all. To continue: industrial minerals, $296,200; review and resources, $197,100; geological map production, $553,100; data retrieval and education, $136,800; regional geological service, $304,300; petroleum resources, $350,600; and aid to exploration—our very popular mineral assistance programme—$1 million. That totals $3,934,500. It's right there.

Mr. Stokes: It would be a lot more helpful to the member for Owen Sound and everybody in this House if you detailed it in a more sensible way than in this book form. There's nothing other than the telephone directory which is more confusing in the way you draw up this.

Mr. Sargent: I didn't hear that. Say it again.

Mr. Chairman: I think that matter is repetitious, too. I think he has been told before.

Mr. Stokes: Are you finished?

Mr. Sargent: No, I am not finished. I didn't hear what you said. Was it important?

Mr. Deans: It was helpful. He said the book was misleading.

Mr. Sargent: There is no way that I can follow it and I'm an average guy, I hope. I'm no smarter than the worst guy in the

House. But I happen to represent 60,000 people and I don't know what the hell is going on here. I have the right to ask; that's my job; that's what I get paid for. This bunch of arrogant people here tell me that I can't ask questions.

Mr. Chairman: There were two previous—

Mr. Sargent: I'm still on my feet but, okay, I'll listen to your objection.

Mr. Chairman: There were two previous times when you could have asked the questions that you want to ask. However, you apparently were not here. I have given you a lot of latitude.

Mr. Sargent: I know you have, sir. Okay. May I ask the minister, then, in finality: You have had operations then on the book—the only book we are given to deal business with so far as past performance goes. We have a book of future performance here entitled Expenditure Estimates, 1972-73. You are asking us as legislators, as men who ran city operations, who ran budgets, who made decisions, more than the minister has, much more. We ran studies; we ran a good operation for many years. We know what goes on in this business, being business people. We make up budgets, and so we do things with past performance. You give us a deal here to operate for 1971 and Mr. Chairman says I can't use it as a guideline. You tell me that the 35 firms who did business as airlines, on top of the air force you have, are non-existent, and that you are going to do business with one firm now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is back to the same subject.

Mr. Sargent: I know I am, and I am on a pretty hot subject.

Mr. Chairman: I think the member is confusing the situation. Really what we are discussing now is the former Department of Mines. What you are referring to is what was in the previous Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Sargent: I want to ask one final question and I will sit down. Will the minister in charge of the air force tell me what you get when the Conservative Party gets one of your planes to go to a convention?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Tory party pay the government for that?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is now out of order.

Mr. Sargent: I will not sit down until I hear the answer to that.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to have to call the hon. member out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Do you pay for that plane that your party—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The Tory party does not engage our aircraft.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you ran one to Muskoka last weekend for the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis). Did he pay for it for the Conservative Party?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think you have had the Premier's explanation on his use of the aircraft.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is out of order again.

Mr. Sargent: I guess I am, but it is a hell of a good question.

Mr. Chairman: Would you please direct it to the proper minister in that regard?

The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Yes. I want a breakdown on the $4 million estimate that you have in this vote for access to resources. I have a release here from your colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton), saying:

> A contract for a resources road in the Thunder Bay district has been awarded to J. M. Pitt, of Willowdale, in the amount of $376,000.

Is that part of this money? And if so, what resource does it go to and when will it reach there? I have some more on it but I wanted to ask this first. First things first.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is part of the NORT committee fund, part of the $4 million that is budgeted in this year's expenditure.

This particular contract is from the Pickle Crow access road northerly and it is designed, of course, to follow the known geology in that particular area. It follows the sand eskars that occur, so as to make the cost as minimal as possible. We will be constructing, I think, another 10 miles in this particular area and then we will re-examine our position as to continuing on to Balmertown.

It may well be that it will terminate there for the time being. We will establish an airport there to service such areas as Round Lake, Big Trout Lake, Kasabonika Lake, Port Severn and other Indian communities north of that particular site. But the resource there is people, of course. We want to serve them to the best of their interests in that particular area.

Mr. Stokes: Do you want to get into that? Have you asked your people at Round Lake whether they want the road in there?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I have, and we are not putting the road into there.

Mr. Stokes: That is right. So people aren't the resources that you are directing the road to. Let's be honest about it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well it will certainly reduce the cost of importing goods and merchandise.

Mr. Stokes: Okay, if you want to build an airstrip at the end of it, fine, it is fair game. But let's call it that. It is not really a road to resources at all.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, it will be.

Mr. Stokes: Can you give me a breakdown of the $400,000, or is it too detailed?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I haven't got it here with me because it is just this year's programme and we haven't got that delegated. But I will tell the member—I think he is interested—that there are sufficient funds in this year's vote to clean up the matter with regard to the Gull Bay Indian band. There was a commitment of $105,000 and then I think $150,000 or $175,000 to improve the road through that particular area. In total it is around $200,000 to $300,000 going in there.

Mr. Stokes: Okay. Now I want to get into two other unrelated matters as quickly as possible. "Ontario to ease pit, quarry permits"—and you are quoted as having said that legislation would be introduced that will make it easier for private companies to get pit and quarry permits for Crown land in northern Ontario. Under the legislation, you said, the companies will be able to continue their practice of not rehabilitating the pits when they are finished in northern Ontario. You said that under existing law an operator can get an annual permit to open a pit or quarry on Crown lands. There were 449 permits issued last year, most of them in northern Ontario, you stated.

The indication was at that time that you were really going to do a job on rehabilitating pits and quarries in southern Ontario—

Mr. Deans: You are turning them into junkyards.

Mr. Stokes: —and everybody was going to have a free hand just to tear apart the landscape in northern Ontario.

Can you make a brief statement indicating that that is, in fact, not the case and you are going to lower the boom on these people who are opening up pits indiscriminately, a good many of them by departments of this government, without any regard to the environment and the adverse effect of opening these up indiscriminately without any regard to people and ecology and aesthetics and all of that?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Let me first point out that there will be certain areas, high priority areas or areas that have a heavy density of gravel pits surrounding the major built-up areas, that could well be designated under the Pits and Quarries Control Act, which is similar to what is in southern Ontario. As an example, Sudbury or Fort William, or Thunder Bay could be designated under the Pits and Quarries Control Act, where the individual operator would be compelled to do the rehabilitation on his particular site. That is that.

It is a little confusing and I know the members sometime just can't fathom the problems that we have. In other areas, to which I know the member is referring, in the remote areas where gravel pits were opened up indiscriminately, this has come to a stop, because permits must be obtained from the department. While we may have been lax in the past, we have tightened this up considerably. The royalty to those operators who operate on Crown lands has now been increased from 10 to 15 cents. So, they are paying 15 cents on Crown lands.

Mr. Stokes: All over Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: All over Ontario. Those funds go into the consolidated revenue fund. That is a royalty we get. We have budgeted this year for the first time for the start of a programme which we hope will accelerate on a year-to-year basis. This year we have $50,000 which we will use to rehabilitate gravel pits in Crown lands strictly in northern Ontario.

What is happening is that an operator goes in to build a road. He obtains a permit and he might take out a couple of hundred thousand yards. The pit is not exhausted and it could be used by a further contractor who may come along and rehabilitate that road or do some further work in that particular area. So, it wouldn't make sense to rehabilitate it before it is exhausted.

This is why we are taking the royalty off first, putting it in the consolidated revenue fund and, as the pits become exhausted, then we will rehabilitate them. We have four or five areas which we'll be operating in this year. I think I mentioned to the member earlier that one of them is in the Schreiber area. We will be doing some rehabilitation work there which will be the start of a major rehabilitation programme for these pits. We are going to start on the ones that are exhausted first.

Mr. Stokes: But you are not going to allow these people to go in and open up 10 pits where one would suffice in a given area?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, sir, we certainly are not.

Mr. Stokes: That is what is happening, as you well know.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are going to put our foot down. As a matter of fact, we have met on two or three occasions with the Department of Transportation and Communications. They are the first ones to admit that in the past they haven't lived up to the requirements that they should have in certain setbacks in the road and certain infractions. We have laid down certain rules and regulations that apply to wayside pits and they are going to abide by them. So, we can see a major movement here in the rehabilitation of those exhausted pits along the major highways. They have agreed and they are willing to co-operate with us and we will use our inspectors to assist them.

Further to this, prior to my coming into this particular department, the former Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) heartily endorsed a request from you to him to reforest those areas that we are rehabilitating. We have a good programme going for northern Ontario, and I am hoping it will accelerate each year as we go along.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, my final question on this vote is—I want some information on the Ontario Energy Board. My question stems from the annual report of TransCanada PipeLines. On page 8, I quote one paragraph which says

> In August, 1971, the company entered into agreements with its major distribution customers in Ontario under which the company will collect, effective Jan. 1, 1972, an increase in price of 2.1 per cent per 1,000 cubic for substantially all gas delivered to these companies and consumed in Ontario. These agreements will apply until the National Energy Board fixes rates to be charged by the company, by its decision on second phase of the company's rate application.

What control has the National Energy Board over these rate increases, and how would you allow them to place an interim rate increase before it was authorized by the National Energy Board? I'm just wondering, how does the Ontario Energy Board get involved? And do you consider it to be fair game for them to just unilaterally effect an increase pending a decision by the National Energy Board?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the hon. member that this agreement to which he refers was a separate private agreement reached by the distributors in the Province of Ontario with the importer of natural gas.

Mr. Stokes: It had nothing to do with the price to the consumer?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It had nothing to do with the Province of Ontario, or the National Energy Board, or the Ontario Energy Board. The rates are fixed, and if there's any change to the consumer at the distribution level then they must make an application to the Ontario Energy Board and have a rate base hearing.

They are going, I gather, on the assumption—and I think the assumption was that the National Energy Board did agree to an increase to TransCanada. This decision has already been handed down by the National Energy Board. That rate has already been fixed, so the TransCanada people know that they are going to get an increase. So on that assumption I suppose the distributors feel that they would also get an increase at the distribution level, but they will have to prove their case and justify the increase before the Ontario Energy Board.

Mr. Stokes: It says: "these agreements will apply until the National Energy Board fixes rates to be charged by the company by its

decision." At the time of this printing, it wasn't.

So I'm just wondering, did the distributors absorb this particular increase on their own without passing it on to the consumer? And if that's the case—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, they have. I think the hearing is going on now, with regard to the distribution, as to how the increase will be levelled to the various customers. That is going on in Ottawa now.

Mr. Stokes: Have you filed an intervention, or—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, we have people there.

Mr. Stokes: You have?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, we have.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister a few questions dealing with royalties on the gas wells that are being developed in Lake Erie. Could he tell me how much the province attains in revenue from the gas wells on Lake Erie?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'm informed that the royalty is 10 per cent of the field price, and the rent to the oil company is 50 cents an acre for the area they hold.

Mr. Haggerty: What is the total amount in revenue? Could you tell me that?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Approximately $400,000 last year?

Mr. Haggerty: About $400,000 last year?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

Mr. Haggerty: Could the minister tell me whether the transmission lines at the bottom of the lake now are being assessed by the Department of Municipal Affairs, the same as they would assess the lines if they were on land?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'm just informed that they are.

Mr. Haggerty: All right. In the public accounts, 1971, there was an expenditure to underwater gas developers of $22,655. Could you tell me what that was for?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The plugging of various wells in the lake.

Mr. Haggerty: You mean the province is paying to plug off these gas wells out on Lake Erie?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, those were oil wells that were considered to be hazardous in Lake Erie. The province does undertake to plug those.

Mr. Haggerty: Why would the province assume this responsibility, the cost of plugging off these wells? You could run into an expenditure here of two or three hundred thousand dollars. Is this not the responsibility of the developers in the area, regardless of what it is?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am just informed that this was a decision of the International Joint Commission with regard to the Great Lakes. The decision at that time was that the cost would be shared with the companies and this is the reason, to guarantee that there would be no hazard from oil wells.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, we are denying them the right to that oil.

Mr. Renwick: Why doesn't the company bear the full cost?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They were given the right, to start off with, to look for oil, then that was denied to them.

Hr. Haggerty: I think the whole agreement that you have with the developers in that particular area is for gas not for oil, so why should the province be paying the cost of plugging off these oil wells?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As I pointed out, the rules of the game changed. They were given the right to search for oil and they did bring these wells into production. Then the International Joint Commission changed the rules in the middle of the ball game. And because of the change in the rules it was decided that this burden, this extra cost, would be shared with the companies, which is a fair agreement, I think.

Mr. Haggerty: In other words, what the minister is telling me is they don't know whether they are going to get gas or oil once they drill in there, right?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That is correct.

Mr. Haggerty: We understand that part. Now, supposing they happen to hit an oil well and you had a blow-off, does it mean

that the province is going to have to assume all that cost of cleaning up the pollution and the oil companies or the gas companies get off scot-free? This is what the minister is telling me.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, this is not the case, because under the new agreements since this change of policy came into effect, these companies that drill in Lake Erie deposit a bond of $100,000 with the province to guarantee to clean up the lake and to correct any pollution that may be caused.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I think it is bad policy for the government to pay the total cost of plugging these wells. I think it is the responsibility of the companies or developers in the area.

The other matter I want to discuss with the minister deals with the pits and quarries, particularly the ones in Pelham township; I believe it is Moyer Sand and Gravel. There were two pits involved, one on each side of the municipal road, and they had the encroachment come up and almost destroy the municipal road. I wonder if that problem has ever been settled and who is responsible for putting that road back in line with the safety conditions that apply in this particular instance? I believe the minister was supposed to meet a delegation of the municipal council a year ago and got bogged down with some other business.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I am fully aware of the situation to which the member refers, because I had anticipated going out and viewing the situation myself but something developed at the last moment and I couldn't. Certainly I apologize for that.

Possibly, if the situation has not been resolved we can go back at it again. I am told that the matter has been left with the company and the municipality to resolve between themselves. However, there doesn't appear to be much headway being made.

Mr. Haggerty: Does the minister not agree with me then that it should be his department that steps into it and gets the matter resolved? I think under the legislation and the regulations that apply to the Mining Act, it is the responsibility of the department to see that this doesn't happen.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The Pits and Quarries Act.

Mr. Haggerty: The Pits and Quarries Act now, but it is under the Department of Mines.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If they don't come to an agreement, of course, they will have to rehabilitate that area with the road as is. I think when I introduced the Pits and Quarries Act I pointed out that while the legislation was effective today it was not retroactive, and this is one of our problems.

Mr. Haggerty: But I believe the regulations under sections of the Mining Act did cover this particular instance, and you had to keep back so many feet from a road allowance. In this particular instance they went right up almost to the edge of the road; that is, the travelled portion of the road.

The other matter I raised with the minister, I think it was a year ago, dealt with the removal of sand from the sand dunes in a portion of the township of Bertie, particularly in the Point Abino area. I said that a certain Buffalo yacht club was carrying on the operation of mining in a sense, removing the sand which was being sold for material to build asphalt paving on the highways in the area. I noticed that it is continuing with the operation. There is no licence issued. There is no fence erected for protection of the public. I was wondering if the minister had sent anyone in there to make the inspection. It was brought to his attention last year dealing with the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I don't recall that particularly at the moment, but I'll check into it. If we haven't, we'll have somebody there look into it right away.

Mr. Haggerty: Regardless of which way you look at it, as long as they get a permit to do it that's all I am concerned about. I don't like to see them operate outside the law.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'll certainly check that part, too.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to question the minister about two or three brief matters. First of all I was wondering if I had heard the figures wrongly. He was giving some figures about exploration and on some of them I wasn't sure if I had the right figure. I thought I heard him say that Texas Gulf Sulphur spent some—maybe I'm wrong; he'll correct me perhaps—$12 million for exploration before they found the mine, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Something like that, approximately.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, something like that. Did the minister, before giving all these figures, multiply them by four or just this particular one?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, the information I have is approximately $12 million.

Mr. Shulman: I see. Where does the minister get his information?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: From my officials.

Mr. Shulman: I see. Could you lean forward and whisper in their ears and find out where they got the figure of $12 million? And if they still wish to stand behind that figure? Perhaps they would like to adjust the figure slightly downward at the moment before we give some facts?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): I would think most of it was done in your backyard!

Mr. Ferrier: Better ask Brady Lee! He might straighten you out.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: To the best of his knowledge this was $12 million in Canada.

Mr. Shulman: In Canada?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Wait a minute—Texas Gulf Sulphur back in the Twenties did some exploration in British Columbia. Is he adding that in, too? Is that the idea? Before they found their mine there. Is that what he's doing?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, this is a six-year period.

Mr. Shulman: Over a six-year period? Let's get some facts on the record. It just so happens you happened to strike a chord where I have some knowledge, but to be sure I sent down to the legislative library and had them send me up the authoritative book on the subject. I'll refer you to page 7 of that authoritative book, written by an author with whom I am sure you are familiar. It says here: "Texas Gulf in fact had spent—"

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What's his name?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What's his name?

Mr. Shulman: To continue: "Close to $3 million finding and drilling 65 anomalies in the preceding years with no results." Now I happen to know just by chance that that author got the figures directly from the vice-president of Texas Gulf.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Who is the author?

Mr. Shulman: The author is one of the members of the Legislature. Modesty forbids me from mentioning his name.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You wouldn't expect us to believe that, would you? My officials didn't believe that record, I can tell you that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's "How to make a million."

Hon. Mr, Winkler: Give us the name!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the author happened to get the figures from the vice-president of Texas Gulf, and the vice-president of Texas Gulf was kind enough to send me the annual reports from the previous six years so that I could corroborate the figures. I get my figures from the vice-president of the company and from the annual reports. I am curious where the minister gets his figures from, which are four times too high? Now would he care to make any comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Who is going to believe who in this case?

Mr. Deans: I believe the member for High Park.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You may believe him but when you talk about forked tongues he's got two of them.

Mr. Deans: Well, you asked!

Mr. Shulman: I can see, Mr. Chairman, from the comments that I have struck a sensitive chord.

Mr. Stokes: I believe the vice-president of Texas Gulf.

Mr. Shulman: I only bring this up — I don't really want to embarrass the minister, he's not a bad fellow, Mr. Chairman—the only reason I bring this up is to show that his figures are somewhat exaggerated and—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It depends upon what authority you are basing your opinion on.

Mr. Shulman: The vice-president of Texas Gulf. Would you—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's what you say. You're quoting from your book.

Mr. Shulman: Well, he hasn't made any objection since the book's been out. As a matter of fact, they have found no single fact in here that was wrong.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What about the editor in Montreal?

Mr. Shulman: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The editor in Montreal didn't think much of it.

Mr. Shulman: There are lots of editors who don't think too much of it. In fact, obviously there are not too many people who thought too much of it—I only sold eight copies. But Texas Gulf bought one of them, and they have no objections to the contents. My mother bought the other seven.

Anyway, I'd like to ask the minister, through the Chairman, if this figure for shared exploration costs is for drilling or exploring mines?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's for surface exploration only—drilling and underground work.

Mr. Shulman: I see. Surface only and underground—but not in the air!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Certainly if you start drilling you've got to go under.

Mr. Shulman: All right. Well, we've got that quite clear—surface only and underground. When you assist prospective mines this way, by giving them money, do the companies give you the results of the explorations?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, they do—and we don't give them money.

Mr. Shulman: Sorry. When you assist them—when you assist them in this $3,861,000 programme.

I'm sort of curious: There is a mine, whose name I believe the minister has heard on one or two occasions; I think it's Silver Shields. Did that particular mine, as a result of the drilling that was done with the assistance of the government, give you the results of their drilling?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They will not give us the results of their drilling. If they go into production, then the information is theirs. But if nothing develops from the use of our dollars for exploration and the property is turned back and they have no more use for it, then the information they gather is turned over to us. Obviously, if they go into production and return to us the funds that we assisted them with, then we have no right to the information. But the information they gather in the normal course of events in areas that don't come into production, will be brought in and used for public knowledge.

Mr. Shulman: How long do you wait after the drilling is done before they must inform you whether they are or they aren't going to go into production? In other words, in this particular case, how long are you going to wait before you ask for the drill results?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It would be a fiscal year.

Mr. Shulman: Whose fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It would be our fiscal year. We would wait until next year at this time to hear from them.

Mr. Shulman: Doesn't the minister find that rather odd?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No.

Mr. Shulman: If a company is doing drilling in this province, even if they weren't being assisted by you—but I think it's rather important since they are being assisted by you—are these things kept secret, or are they not supposed to be made public immediately? Your colleague is here from Consumer and Commercial Relations, and I believe we're supposed to have a rule in this province of timely disclosure; under this vote, where you are assisting them with funds, why would you wait a year? Timely disclosure, as I understand it, means that results are supposed to be released by the 10th day of the following month.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If they make this information available, they'll want assessment credit.

Mr. Shulman: Sorry?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If they want assessment credit on their claims and their developed work, then the information is brought to us. But in the other case, with regard to securities, that rule would come under the Securities Commission. But I think we'd have to give them a normal period of time to make a decision as to when they're coming into production. We are not concerned with that aspect.

Mr. Shulman: I'm not asking about that decision. What I find very strange is that if drilling is being done on a property and you are assisting by paying for it, why would you wait a whole year to get the results?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would say to the hon. member that this particular programme only came into effect last September. We haven't even gone a full fiscal year.

Mr. Shulman: Right.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We're going into a whole new area and a new programme. We have to give these people a reasonable length of time, and certainly it doesn't seem odd to me to give them this length of time.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps the minister and I are on different wave-lengths, for a change. But if a drill hole goes down and a drilling programme has been completed, as apparently this programme has been completed in this specific mine, why in the world—they've already printed up copies for themselves—wouldn't they give a copy to the minister? Then the minister wouldn't get embarrassing questions put to him which he couldn't answer, like, "Is there a mine up there?"

I just don't see why you'd want to give them a year, or six months, or one month. They have done it. They've completed it. Why in the world shouldn't you ask for the results? Why shouldn't they give you the results if you are assisting them financially? Whether it's a loan, or whether it's a gift? I think it's irrelevant.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, I can't agree. I think we have to give these people a reasonable length of time. They have to make certain decisions if they are going to develop that particular property. They might need the information for their own purposes, or for purposes other than the requirements of the securities commission. I see nothing wrong with that at all.

Mr. Shulman: All right. I'll leave the minister there. Or we'll come back to that on another occasion.

I just want to ask him one other brief matter. Does mines safety come under one of these votes? Mines engineering—does that include safety? What is mines engineering?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, that's mines safety.

Mr. Shulman: I see. Well now, I presume you have inspectors who go about? I would like to ask the minister, does he feel that the members of this House should be able to go up to these places and see if the mines are being run safely?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, they can go up. But I can say to the members of this House that certainly they are not authorities. They don't have the technical experience nor the knowledge of an operating mine. They should be accompanied, I think, by somebody—if they want to be.

Mr. Shulman: Would the minister think that if one of the members of this House went up to, say, Inco, just for example, just to pick that one, and ask—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They do every day.

Mr. Shulman: —and ask to see the safety features, and to be shown through with someone who is qualified—do you think he would be allowed through, to see if they are doing things according to our standards?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think that he should go to the local mines inspector and discuss it with him. That's his responsibility. We are holding him responsible to make sure that these operations—

An hon. member: There are all kinds of—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —are run using safe methods. And they are there. They are doing a job. Certainly I am satisfied with what they are doing.

Mr. Shulman: I see. I understand you are satisfied. But as you know, you and I don't always see eye to eye on everything. What I want to know is, if I, as a member, or the member from Timmins (Mr. Ferrier), or the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes), or the member for Sudbury (Mr. Germa), wanted to see with his own eyes whether the safety features are being followed—I am taking Inco as an example, just because it happens to come to mind—if I were to go to Sudbury next week and announce myself at the front gate and say: "Hey, I'm an MPP. Could I see the safety features? Could I go through with one of your inspectors to explain things to me?" Do you think that it would be all right? I mean, do you think I should be allowed to see these things?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You've been in there anyway.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, you know, I think there is a certain respect and courtesy that

must be extended to the owners of those mines. After all, you are treading on their property.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In cognito.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Who are you, as a member of the Legislature, to be encroaching on their area? If you want to contact the local mining inspector, then he'll assist you. Really he will. He will help.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He's done it. He has done it all.'

Mr. Shulman: Well, the reason I picked Inco is because I happen to be one of the owners there. I am a shareholder, so we don't have to worry about that aspect of it for the moment. But let's suppose, as one of your—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You are a shareholder in Inco?

Mr. Shulman: One share. One share.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And you had to sneak into the mine, is that right?

Mr. Shulman: Now, I want to get—I'd like to pursue this a little further.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You had to sneak into the mine.

Mr. Shulman: Now, under mines safety—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You couldn't get in as a shareholder.

Mr. Shulman: I bought that one share when I was going in, so they wouldn't charge me with trespassing. That's the time I went in the back door. But I am not talking about going in the back one, I am talking about going in the front door.

Now we don't have to worry about going on their property, because we have already agreed it's my property. Does the minister think that if I went up there next Sunday, or next Monday, and announced myself and came to the front door and said: "Hey, I'm an owner, and I'm an MPP, and I'm interested in safety features, and I'd like to come through and take a look". Does the minister think that I should be allowed to see?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: How did you get in the last time?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, I don't think so.

Mr. Shulman: No? The minister doesn't think that—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: How did you get in the last time?

Mr. Shulman: Last time I went in as a worker.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh yes.

Mr. Shulman: Well, the minister doesn't think that the MPP—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Did you bring your lunch pail or what?

Mr. Shulman —should be allowed to see the—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As I said before, I think you should consult with the owners of the mine. Discuss it with them in a normal way. Don't go around like a sleuth or a Sherlock Holmes, with a magnifying glass looking for problems—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He'd like that better. He'd like to be a—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I don't think this is the way to approach it. Not at all.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Sherlock Holmes, the investigator—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Put on your police belt.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They want to co-operate. They are not out swindling everybody, so to speak, casting a shadow of doubt all the time. See the local inspector, the mines inspector. Contact the owners of the mine, I'm sure they'll co-operate 100 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Put on your police belt and walk in the front door.

Mr. Shulman: Forgive me for pursuing this, but there is a point to this. I want to get the minister on the record. And I want to get this quite clear.

As a member of this House, interested in these safety features, is the minister saying, if we contact the local mines inspector, that he will make arrangements to go through with us? Is that what he is saying?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I said you are to contact the local inspector and the owner of the particular mine, and if they agree, fine and dandy. But our mines inspectors are allowed on the property. We have them there all the time. Certainly they are.

Mr. Shulman: Do the mines inspectors give advance notice before they go?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, they do not.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I thought the minister might be interested. Last Sunday I went up to Inco—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Shulman: I thought the minister might be interested. Obviously his feelings are shared in other parts of the province.

Last Sunday I went up to Inco; this time I went to the front door instead of the back door, and I said, "Hey, I am an owner," and "Hey, I am an MPP, and I would like to see all the great things you are doing up here and the way you are carrying out the safety features." And they said, "No way."

This was the policeman on the door; for some reason he was wearing a town policeman's uniform. I thought he was an Inco guard. He said he was an Inco guard, but he was wearing a town policeman's uniform. He explained—I shouldn't say that—someone there explained that Inco owned the town anyway; so rather than hire their own police, they just use the town police.

So I said, "I am sure there is a misunderstanding. You had better call your boss." He got on the phone and after a while a sergeant came down—also wearing a town policeman's uniform for some reason—and I said, "Gee, I would like to see the great safety features you have here. Can I have a look? I am an owner, and I am an MPP." He said, "Oh, gee, there's no way you can see that stuff unless we get advance warning you are coming—you know, maybe a few days ahead of time." I can't imagine what changes they would want to make.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They'd just like to know out of courtesy.

Mr. Shulman: Anyway I said, "I am sure there is a misunderstanding. Won't you call your boss and see if I can't come and see this mine?" So he got on the phone and he phoned the deputy chief of police—very strange at Inco; you go up the line through the police department.

The deputy chief of police said, "No way. There is no way. You are not going in there."

I said, "I can go in on the next shift."

They put two extra policemen at the gate then, and I didn't get in last Sunday, needless to say.

I was a little upset about this, because I hadn't attempted to sneak in. I went up and I said, "I am interested in this vote. It is on now. I want to know if you are doing the things that good old Leo down in Toronto says you are doing."

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But you did before.

Mr. Shulman: I suspect the worst.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You wouldn't know what to look for.

Mr. Shulman: As the hon. minister said the other night, I have an evil mind. And I guess I am getting a paranoid mind, because if they have nothing to hide, what are they hiding?

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): They were afraid for your safety.

An hon. member: They were hiding a second set of books.

Mr. Shulman: I don't think they were hiding a second set of books. What they are hiding—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Did you sell your one share?

Mr. Shulman: No, I still have the one share. I thought I might have to go back in there one of these days, and I don't want to be charged with trespassing.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You will try again.

Mr. Shulman: But if they have nothing to hide, and if your inspectors are really doing their job, why would they want to keep an MPP out?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not all MPPs.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would suggest you ask that question of the company, because we are charged with the responsibility of inspecting mines for safety—and we do that, we carry out that responsibility. If you as an individual—you say you are a shareholder in that company — then I think the proper thing to do is approach the company and get their permission. This is the proper way to approach it. I think nothing of it at all. I am sure if you had used that approach with the proper notice, you would have been allowed in.

Mr. Shulman: The minister is quite right. If they have enough notice they will let anybody in to see; this is the point I am trying

to make to you, and you might be interested in this. I don't believe they are carrying out your safety regulations. I'll tell you what happened.

The chairman of the board of Inco—his name was Wingate—was going to go up there from New York some months ago. He gave them advance notice, two weeks. Believe it or not, the chairman of the board gives his own company advance notice. I am told by the people I spoke to in Sudbury last week that the work that was put into the Copper Cliff smelter in the two weeks before Mr. Wingate arrived was incredible; they cleaned up, they painted up, they turned off the sulphur dioxide producing machines. They had the blowers going constantly. The place was unrecognizable the day he arrived.

The same thing, they tell me, happens with the tourists. Tourists are taken through there five days a week, beginning May 15; they are taken on a very prescribed route, which route is scrubbed every day and painted every week, and the guides who take the tourists through are told, "Don't let them wander off the prescribed path." All you have to do is wander approximately 12 ft off the path and you see all the dirt and the filth and the stuff lying about, which is dangerous.

I am suggesting to the minister that the timing of the visits of his safety inspectors is known in advance. I don't know how they know, but they know; this is what I have been told. I do know that in preparation for visits from anyone, they make massive changes in there.

Just last Tuesday there were seven Russians over here to inspect Inco's mining equipment, the equipment they have in the control room, and apparently they were interested in buying some of this equipment. Inco went so far as to take four of their own technicians who had been working on a machine that had broken down and made them go down the cellar and stay there all day, because the Russians were upstairs and they didn't want the Russians to have any idea that any of their machines would ever break down!

Now if they will go that far with a delegation like that, or with a group, or with their own board chairman, I suspect they are very adept, very adept, Mr. Minister, at fooling your safety inspectors.

I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that your attitude in this is wrong. You should say an MPP, any MPP—even a Conservative MPP—even without owning any shares, should have access on arrival—not to barge in but to announce themselves—they should have access to a place like that where they can go through with someone from the company and see what's going on.

I suggest to you that they are fooling you. I suggest to you we are going to bring proof to you and I suggest that there is only one way to do it, because I don't think you can find out yourself. Some brave MPP is going to have to go up to Sudbury and grow a beard and go in with the workers again with a camera.

Now, that is really a hell of a way to have to get evidence. But I am saying to you, Mr. Minister, that I don't think Inco is doing the job you think it is doing and I don't think your safety inspectors are doing the job in there that they should be.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1805.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: I have several items that I would like to deal with. They are all very short. I am concerned about the composition of the Energy Board. I understand that the Act provides for a minimum of three and a maximum of five board members, and during the last year the board consisted of two full-time members and one part-time member.

The member for Riverdale brought this up a couple of years ago and the minister at that time was concerned that there were three full-time members and one part-time member. Now I think that your chairman is just an acting chairman as well. In view of the fact that there are very significant things that this board has to consider, are you considering appointing more members to the board? I wonder, before I go on, if you could give us some indication of this?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this matter is under very active consideration right at the present moment. I think it is fair to say that they are waiting for the report of the task force on energy, because if there are some significant suggestions in there it could well be that that board will maybe have to be much larger than it presently is, to undertake the workload that they may suggest it undertakes.

Mr. Ferrier: Another matter that my colleague from Riverdale raised was whether the Ontario Energy Board projected or fore-

cast the energy needs required for the province on say a 10 or 20 or 30-year basis. Do they take a forecast of how much energy we are going to need from the various kinds of energy and—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just before I answer the member's comments may I pay a tribute to the two men of the Ontario Energy Board, Mr. MacNabb and Mr. Jackson, who have taken on the responsibility and are doing a tremendous job, handicapped as they are, and short-staffed. I want it on the record that they have taken this on and are handling the job tremendously. Hopefully we can get back up to the strength where it should be.

In answer to your direct question, yes, the task force on energy is looking at the long-range requirements of the province and all aspects of energy, be it hydro, or gas, or fuel oil or whatever it is. This has been their responsibility and, hopefully, that report will be got out very soon.

Mr. Ferrier: I, too, would like to commend the members of the Energy Board, because they went through a long hearing as to the rate in northern Ontario. I know that was a long drawn-out affair. I felt that they made a very good decision, and that they helped us in the north quite a bit. I think it was well done, but I am glad this consideration is under way to consider heating fuel, and so on, there.

I know I have sent a letter to the minister and he sent the letter on to this board or commission. This letter was the result of a motion passed by the Northeastern Municipal Association, hoping that this would be taken into consideration.

The next question I have to deal with arises out of a letter that was written to my leader by the recording secretary of the steelworkers' union in Ear Falls, Ontario. It concerns two meetings—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Do you know where Ear Falls is?

Mr. Ferrier: —that they had, one with the mining inspector up there, in which they stressed the unsafe conditions that were at that particular mine and outlined them, I believe, in some detail. They felt that working conditions were unsafe and they reported at the Griffith Mine the following: first-aid problems, 907; medical visits, 106; compensation, 23; lost days, 2,363.

Then they had a meeting with the minister himself. He met with them for quite a long time—an hour and a half. They went over some of these things and he agreed that the Mining Act itself was limited in some articles. He would like articles 610(1)(a) revised to permit unions the right to have a union rep on safety tours at the mines and the plant. I believe they went over the whole safety aspects there.

They had written in the middle of April that they wanted to know how many times the inspector inspected the mine, and so on. Their answer was once.

Is that being looked after properly for those people? Have your mining inspectors been in there and are the safety conditions improving for those people? Evidently when they wrote to us here they were still not too well satisfied.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think if you would check the date of that letter—

Mr. Ferrier: Yes. The letter is dated April 15.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: April 15, just recently?

Mr. Ferrier: That is the letter that they wrote to you.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I have had discussions with them.

Mr. Ferrier: Then they wrote to us on—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I had discussions with them and they asked—

Mr. Ferrier: —April 17—two days later.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They made a number of requests with which I complied and the information they wanted was directed to them. It was my understanding that they were meeting with the company on a regular basis and that many of the problems that they brought to my attention were being resolved. The inspector, Dick Murray from Kenora, is up there on a regular basis and they have access to him whenever they want.

The discussions are going on and, as far as I'm concerned, I gather that they are being satisfied. Certainly, the discusisons are going on.

Mr. Ferrier: Well, I'm pleased to hear that. I hope that everything is rectified, and so forth.

I would like to deal with another item. We've talked about the silicosis study of Dr. Paterson. There is also the problem of emphy-

sema and cancer in miners. I know at Inco Paul Falkowski discussed the problems that sulphur dioxide gas creates in the men and pointed out that a larger percentage of them died of respiratory diseases and heart problems, and so forth.

Is this part of the study that Dr. Paterson is doing? Or if he is not doing it, would the minister consider setting up a special study to deal with how all these other lung conditions are related, or not related, to the kind of dust and noxious gases that miners are subjected to in their course of employment?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, the study that is being made at the present time by Dr. Paterson hopefully will be completed by the end of this year. But it deals solely with silicosis.

Certainly I will discuss it with my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) because there may be some areas here which that particular department should be involved in.

Mr. Haggerty: What about the reciprocal agreement between other provinces?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, we will be glad to look into that.

Mr. Haggerty: But you were going to look into that two years ago. You were supposed to have an agreement of some kind or another. You should have it by now concerning silicosis.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Maybe it is in. If I said we were going to do it, I am sure it is done. But certainly, it is something that I will discuss with the Minister of Health and possibly, during the course of his estimates, you could also discuss it with him at that time.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, I will be glad to do that. If, in fact, these lung conditions are the result of their employment, it would mean that they should be entitled to compensation, death benefits and all the rest of it and there are quite a few wide implications. So, I think, if the minister will intercede, I will be glad to bring it up too.

Do you know if there are noise levels set for the mining industry per se in the Mining Act? I know I took a compensation case and the Hollinger Mine had done a study and knew the decibel ratings in the various activities of their mine. But are there limits that you have set in the Mining Act? Or is it possible that you can set limits as far as noise is concerned in the underground and other operations of the mines?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am informed that they are not spelled out in the Act per se but they must conform and must be acceptable on a health standard with regard to the amount of noise that the individual workman is exposed to. This is geared to the health aspect of it.

Mr. Ferrier: How would they know? Was there some regulation or standard that they can abide by?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Of course, it boils down to what the individual can actually stand. As the member knows, when there is an abundance of noise, or the noise level is so high that they can't stand it, then, of course, the company must provide protective ear equipment, which they do on all occasions.

Mr. Ferrier: I think that that whole area needs a further review, because maybe you should be setting some levels and standards as far as noise is concerned—some indication of what is permitted. I know they wear protective equipment and the problem isn't as acute as it was at one time. But I still think it bears looking into.

The last question I want to ask is, are you able to enforce the legislation and the regulation of the Pits and Quarries Act? There was some indication in a letter at Port Hope that this could only be done by your inspectors on the Niagara Escarpment and you didn't have the staff to do it in other parts of the province.

Can the minister tell me if he is now in a position, and has sufficient staff, to make these inspections wherever these pits and quarries are in the province?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have taken on an extra four inspectors within the specific branch itself to provide the inspection to which you refer in the Pits and Quarries Act.

Mr. Chairman: Does vote 1805 carry?

Mr. Deans: No, sir.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I wrote to the minister—I telephoned the minister and then wrote to him—about some damage that was being done to properties surrounding the Cope Quarry on Saltfleet Mountain.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I've heard nothing about it.

Mr. Deans: No? The people involved haven't heard anything about it either. I want to suggest to you that you pursue this from another angle.

There are a number of homes surrounding the quarry, within a quarter of a mile of either side of it, and I would like if you could find a way to have an inspector spend a little time in the area. If he wants, I would be glad to take a couple of days out of here and go with him to the appropriate places so that he could see where the damage is supposed to be taking place, and then perhaps go back through the various stages to find out the blasting patterns of the quarry.

There's no question that the quarry are now prepared to make a statement that they haven't been blasting in the area these particular homes which I brought to your attention are located in, but they were; they were some months ago, not a long time ago, but only a few months ago. I would like very much if, in the interest of the development —the OHC development—that's going to take place on that mountain we could get a clear understanding now of what occurs in the rock table when the quarry is actually blasting.

The way the escarpment is set up there are various levels of shale table running right through and it stretches back quite a ways into what's known locally as the Leckie Park development, and also to the east, across Highway 20. The quarry is now coming very close to the area of the highway and it appears to be creating damage to the plaster and foundations of a number of the homes.

I think it might be difficult to prove, but nevertheless I don't think that because it's difficult we ought to give up. If the minister could make some kind of a commitment that he would have someone available at a reasonably early date, I would be pleased to spend the time in the area and go with him, just to show him where it is—I'm not interested other than that—and maybe we could get to the bottom of what's causing the difficulty.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I'd be glad to have somebody go out with you and check it, but I thought I signed a letter to you replying to that particular problem? I'm sure I did.

Mr. Deans: No, what happened was, if I may, you did write me a letter asking for a more detailed explanation as to who it was, and I believe we sent you the location as best I could.

You see, we're not talking about a street number on a particular road. We're talking about some homes on Green Mountain Rd., for example, on the east side of Highway 20. We're also talking about some homes on First and Second Rd. W., running off Mud St.

I believe, at that point, there was a little bit of a breakdown and I kind of assumed that maybe they had gone out. People have now told me that this didn't occur.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We'll make somebody available to you to go out and have a look at it.

Mr. Deans: Right, fine.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): I should like to ask a question about the reciprocal arrangements with other provinces in the matter of silicosis. Were your officials able to check that? Have they been entered into?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am informed that they think the Workmen's Compensation Board was working on that particular matter, a reciprocal agreement at the Workmen's Compensation Board level.

Mr. Burr: Has that been made?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'm not sure; I am really not sure.

Mr. Burr: Well, I have a constituent, a retired miner, who has admitted silicosis, but he worked in British Columbia, Quebec and Ontario, and he's left uncompensated.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I can obtain that information and give it to you.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1805 carried? Vote 1806?

Mr. Stokes: Just a moment. You know, it would be a shame if we didn't say something about northern affairs. Ralph Scott's been sitting over there for 20 hours and if we didn't say something about the operation of northern affairs I think it would be a travesty. I would like to say, certainly, on behalf of the people who work in that capacity in my constituency that they are doing a good job. There is a good deal of co-operation between myself and them.

I wonder, though, as a result of the 7,080 cases that you handled, according to the summary for March, 1972, have you learned anything? Has there been any feedback from your department to various other departments to say, "Why don't you have a look at your operation? Maybe there is something wrong?"

I see, from the breakdown that Mines and Northern Affairs are in the vanguard with 796 transactions; second is Labour with 676; third is Social and Family Services with 464; fourth is Transport with 370.

I am wondering what you do with these? Do you go back to those departments and say, "We have 547 compensation cases, all of them deal with this specific segment of your operation. Do you want to have a look at it? Maybe there is something wrong?"

Or when you get to Labour—let's take Municipal Affairs, for instance, 199. Maybe 90 per cent of those deal with a specific thing. How do you break them down? How do you use the information that you get as a result of these transactions to improve the quality of service to people?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Very quickly, Mr. Chairman, this is exactly what we are doing. We are monitoring the complaints. These complaints are tabulated and provided to the various ministers within their respective departments.

I will point out to you that I am very concerned and upset with the amount of complaints and the amount of work that northern affairs is doing for the federal government – unemployment insurance and Canada Pension Plan are good examples of the amount of work that they are doing.

Mr. Stokes: You should not be concerned.

Mr. Deans: You should be happy.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I am concerned because this is a provincial programme and we are paying for it.

Mr. Deans: You should be happy you can serve the people's needs.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Certainly, but we are doing the work for them!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Maybe that's a bad choice of words. Maybe we should go to them and ask them for assistance because we are providing a service. A good service—

Mr. Deans: We are thinking of coming to you for assistance so that we can serve them.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —a really good service. One of the things we don't monitor is the Workmen's Compensation. Since last year, most of that is being handled by the members themselves. We have pushed it back to them. The other departments and other sections are being monitored and that information is being provided to the various ministries.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1806. The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: I want to make one or two comments. Of course, we could get into Iroquois Falls but it is not worth it.

There have been some complaints from some other departments about a man who will go to northern affairs; then Community and Social Services will send their worker and he will say, "You don't have anything to do with those guys. You stay away from them." They sort of intimidate a recipient. I had one come to me the other day about this problem. I think that maybe there is a little job of public relations to do with some of the other departments and so on.

I think that the department as far as its information and helping with certain problems is concerned is a good thing. I think maybe it could be expanded to the other parts of the province. I notice it isn't really meeting the problems of northern Ontario in terms of doing away with their estrangement and some of these problems. I noticed in the Tuesday, May 16, Daily Press in Timmins an article, "Let's start agitating." It was the whole talk starting up all over again about an 11th province.

The federal member for the riding of Cochrane, Ralph Stewart, has published a report and it is getting the support of some of the newspapers and some of the people. If you are going to leave your northern affairs department solely as an information body, solving certain problems and communicating, it is not going to be enough.

You are not going to satisfy the people of the north and the problems that were there before are going to continue and the people are going to become more and more dissatisfied. I hope you have plans afoot to expand this and to start dealing with policy and recommendations to your colleagues for them to do something to bridge the gap, and really start doing something for the north.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1806 carried?

Mr. Reid: One sentence: In my riding, they are doing a good job.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1806 carried?

Vote 1806 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Mr. Reid: It won't be so easy next time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: This hasn't been easy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn the House I would like to say that tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of the Ministry of Health.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor-General): What is the order of business for Monday?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There is no order of business for Monday. It is a national holiday, I'm pleased to report.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Sounds like a setup.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:33 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 18, 1972

Estimates, Ministry of Natural Resources, Mr. Bernier, concluded 2605

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2636

No. 67

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, May 19, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1972

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors, and this morning in both galleries there are students from Richview Collegiate Institute of Islington.

Statements by the ministry.

REPORT OF TRI-LEVEL INTERIM PLANNING COMMITTEE

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in tabling the report, which I believe has been distributed, of the Tri-Level Interim Planning Committee. This committee was established in April 1971 under the chairmanship of the hon. member for York Mills (Mr. Bales) to establish a basis for a meeting of the three levels of government in Canada. In February of this year I succeeded the hon. member as chairman and representative of the provinces. The other members of the committee are the Hon. Ronald Basford, federal Minister of State for Urban Affairs, and Mayor Marcel D'Amour of Hull, the chairman of the Joint Municipal Committee on Intergovernmental Relations.

The report is the practical outcome of extensive discussion over some period of time in the Tri-Level Planning Committee and in such forums as the conference of Ministers of Municipal Affairs, the conference of First Ministers, and the Joint Municipal Committee on Intergovernmental Relations.

We are now proposing that a tri-level conference be held in November of this year to consider the many common concerns and challenges which underscore the increasingly sophisticated relationships among all levels of government in our federation. More specifically, as you will see in the report, the agenda calls for discussions of these concerns and challenges, the respective roles of each level of government in meeting them and the design of the intergovernmental machinery which will be required.

Ontario has consistently supported the objective of having a useful conference of this kind. We are particularly pleased that our offer in the Speech from the Throne has been accepted and that the conference will be jointly hosted in Toronto by the three levels of government.

The report also recommends that the municipal representation from each province be chosen by the municipal association of the province in consultation with the appropriate provincial minister. It is my intention that in Ontario the choice of municipal representatives will be left completely to the municipal liaison committee, which is composed of the four, soon to be three, major municipal associations of the province.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that this conference will be a first step toward meeting the many common issues involving all three levels of government in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

REPORT OF TRI-LEVEL INTERIM PLANNING COMMITTEE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Further to the hon. minister's statement, can he tell the House whether or not there will be an opportunity for representatives from opposition parties to attend this conference; not necessarily as part of the delegation—I don't think that would be appropriate—but as official observers?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It hasn't been discussed or thought of from the point of view of Ontario. We will take that into consideration at the appropriate time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the conference is going to be here I would think that the decision of this government would probably be followed by the other provincial administrations. Would the minister not agree that it would be a very fair and forward step that he might offer such an invitation? It would then be copied by the other provinces in making up their delegation.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Manitoba, Saskatchewan!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It might.

PLEA BARGAINING IN ONTARIO COURTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: I want to ask him, once again, if he can tell the House the government's position on plea bargaining?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I answered this question from the hon. member on Tuesday last. At that time I said I was going to meet the Crown attorneys next week and I would speak to them as a group about the matter, and after that I would be pleased to convey the plea bargaining situation to this House. I am anxious to meet them, because there must be discussion and I think it is appropriate that it should be in a closed meeting with the Crown attorneys.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary question: Would the minister not agree that the members of this House have as much right as the Crown attorneys to first information on a matter of important policy? Why would he object to telling the House what the government's position is and then informing the Crown attorneys?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I have no objection to telling the House, but the Crown attorneys made certain submissions to my ministry in reference to this matter and I think it appropriate that I discuss this with them and then come back to the House with a final position in reference to the matter.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Doesn't the minister recall certain submissions being made in the House on this matter as well? To continue the question, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, the justification is that those people who offered submissions should be informed first. Would the minister not agree that the members of the House have a prior right to this information?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, I don't.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Is the minister in fact going to offer a tentative position and then perhaps amend it depending upon the reaction from the Crown attorneys?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter for the administration of justice, and I think it quite proper that it should be on a basis of our views and discussions with the Crown attorneys. I don't see that those views will change substantially, but I think it appropriate that it be in discussion with them first.

ORDER OF BUSINESS REMAINING IN SESSION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the House leader: Has he made tentative plans for the introduction of the final list of bills to be submitted from the government at this session; has he kept sort of a running account of the predictions made by his colleagues having to do with bills on regional government, coroners and inquests, health bills; the establishment of a commission on the role of legislation; and has he related this with the fact that 71 hours remain for discussion on the estimates; so that he, as House leader, has an overall view of the work remaining in this session and could make some predictions?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Yes, I think all of the legislation referred to by my hon. friend is under consideration and will be coming forward. In regard to predictions, I think that is more in the ball park of the opposition than of the government. I am endeavouring at the moment to have the estimates dealt with to the best of my ability, and as the legislation that the member referred to comes forward it will be brought into the House to be dealt with in this session, and most of it will be here within a few days.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Is there a deadline that has been accepted by the minister's colleagues on the introduction of legislation? Does he recall in fact that his predecessor, at least the former Premier, used to attempt to impose on his colleagues a deadline of May 15 for new legislation. He could never really impose it, but at least there was a feeling that we should attempt to avoid the introduction of important legislation in what the government would hope to be the last few days of the session.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think the inability to predict in that regard is as obvious now as it was then. There is no deadline—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We will stay here as long as it is necessary to do the people's business. Isn't that right?

An hon. member: Repeat that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If the events of the day prove—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Does the minister mean like Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —no, I am not referring to anything in particular. If the events of the day have any bearing on the way we expedite business we may take a different view of things—I might take a different view of things.

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I might want the members to be here to deal with the bills that we bring forward. I don't want them out running around the country.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will tell the hon. member that the legislation he referred to is very much in our minds and will come forward.

An hon. member: It will be on the order paper on Tuesday.

MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the hon. Minister of Health: Has he made plans to meet with the Society of Medical Officers of Health to discuss some apprehensions that they may feel have to do with certain statements attributed to the minister that might, in fact, indicate a change in position or responsibility for them?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I haven't made plans to meet with the society. I met with all of the medical officers of health several weeks ago; if they didn't turn up, that was their fault. It was a meeting here of all the medical officers of health.

I have requested several medical officers of health to meet with me once the estimates are over, just unofficially, to discuss some of the proposals I have and to get their views on these matters. At the present time I haven't arranged a meeting with the society, but I have indicated to them that I would be prepared to do this at a later time, once I get over the estimates and some of the other problems I have.

An hon. member: What other problems?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary for clarification: The minister indicated that all the MOH's would be invited to meet with him not just any selected group?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I indicated that I had already met—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, but the minister talked about a meeting after the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, that was with the representatives from the society the member talked about.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If not, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

INCREASES IN MUNICIPAL PROPERTY TAXES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, first, a question of the provincial Treasurer: How many public tributes has the Treasurer received commenting on his single-handed responsibility for raising municipal property taxes across the province this year by $80 to $110?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They have been so overwhelming I have lost track of the count.

Mr. Lewis: Right! If they have been that overwhelming, perhaps the Treasurer can consider deferring his legislation for one year until the rebates take effect on the income tax form rather than saddling homeowners with this extraordinary and exceptional increase this year, given the pattern of last year.

Mr. Speaker: Question, Question!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Has the member switched horses again?

Mr. Lewis: No, not at all.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: He used to criticize the rebate system.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): The rebate system is bad but the government shouldn't impose that kind of burden.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer is prepared to go ahead, I take it, in his own inimitable fashion?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I think what the member said was—I don't know whether or not there was a question mark on the end; it was a statement—perhaps I might be prepared to consider?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Having given that unequivocal answer, would the minister be prepared, with all cheques sent out by the government to anybody such as pensioners and so on, to put in a slip to declare that that last municipal tax increase they received was the fault of the provincial government and not of the local government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have a small pamphlet which is in the course of being printed now, which we will be making available to the municipalities to send out with the tax bills or with the assessment notices.

Yes, there is no question about this. That is the first step in, I think rather a large programme, which will be necessary in November, January and February to assist the many people who have never filled in a tax return to do so.

Mr. Deans: Has the government given consideration to the rather onerous burden this change has placed on a goodly number of elderly people?

Hon. Mr. Keough: That is a good question, but I don't know how you are going to achieve getting them this help and relate the assistance of the government on the ability-to-pay principle, without some sort of burden —I don't think it is that great.

Mr. Cassidy: We could have told the Treasurer in five minutes if he had asked.

Mr. Deans: But $80 is a lot of money for most of those people.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right, and presumably they may be eligible for up to $250.

Mr. Deans: But they don't get it until next year.

Mr. Lewis: Not until next year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Wouldn't it be possible to remove some of the burden from the people, whom we are all concerned about, if in fact the change from one programme had not had a hiatus of one year in which no assistance was paid? Surely the minister realizes that planning the transition would have assisted these people who now have to pay an average of $100 extra, certainly in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Certainly it would have assisted them. No doubt the member could have assisted me in finding the $150 million that was necessary to pay out something twice.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the minister indicate, then, if there had not been a gap of a year, he would have made a double payment? Surely there is something between making no payment and, as the minister suggests, making a double payment. I don't see why he has to have a clear year—

Mr. Deans: Of course, there is.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —without any assistance whatsoever and why he is objecting to the alternatives.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member is now saying the rebate system is all right.

Mr. Deans: One more final supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: This will be the final; this is the sixth supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: It is an important matter.

Mr. Deans: Is it not possible to use the same method to pay the $50 and the $100 rebate that is paid to the elderly now, to provide for them the same basic supplement that they would have received this year—the same basic rebate they would have received this year—and let them collect the remainder in their next year's income tax return.

Mr. Lewis: The government has just taken away the pension increase.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that would have been incredibly complicated. It would have complicated it even more for those people who have not filled in forms to then have to make that kind of a deduction next year.

Mr. Lewis: The government effectively took away the entire pension increase.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

WOODGREEN SURVEY REPORT

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Revenue: Has the minister seen the WoodGreen survey report, which will be in all the press today I'm sure; and particularly that paragraph of the report which says if the principal problem facing 524 families is inadequate income, the single problem making their situation virtually unmanageable is the prohibitive cost of housing.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I don't recall having seen the report. However, I must admit there are so many on my desk it could be one of them, but I doubt it.

Mr. Lewis: It just came out. It's no surprise that the cost of housing is prohibitive for many people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't recall hearing of it.

Mr. Lewis: That is rental as well as ownership.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's no surprise either—that and rental, the same thing. That is why this government has such a massive programme of housing. It has been going on for the last six and a half years.

Mr. Cassidy: It is a disaster.

Mr. Lewis: That is why it is a disaster area. If the minister's housing programme is so massive, why won't he help to subsidize—a principle he endorsed in the Legislature just last week—Metro Housing or Metro Properties, when it tries to move large families into properties expropriated for purposes of expressway development? Why won't he subsidize the rent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't see how the fact that we do not subsidize rental directly through OHC for emergency housing situations precludes these people from getting houses, because they are looked after by the municipality, regardless of whether they get a subsidy from OHC or not. So that really is not germane to the problem.

The hon. member is constantly confusing the terms of reference for OHC, in providing a permanent type of accommodation for the people of this province who cannot afford it otherwise, with those emergency situations which arise from time to time and which do not call for the accommodating of such emergency situations in a permanent type of community, which we have been providing for years.

Mr. Cassidy: They arise as a result of the government policy.

Mr. Lewis: There are no houses.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister give to the House a guideline for what percentage of income the government feels is an acceptable limit that should be paid for rent or for housing costs?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a scale which OHC has published and which it works under. I'm sure the hon. member is familiar with that. The highest percentage for our rent-geared-to-income tenants is 25 per cent. And I would assume that's very difficult for some people to accomplish, having regard for their income; that's why we are in the business. There are other people who can afford to pay a higher percentage because of their income.

If the hon. member is asking what I think would be an acceptable percentage of a person's income to go to housing, it would have to be related to the income of the person or the group he is talking about.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: The minister is saying that for people on low and moderate incomes a figure of 25 per cent maximum is what the government considers acceptable. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is correct.

Mr. Cassidy: In that case, is the minister aware that the WoodGreen study showed that families on welfare—that is, on a very low income—were paying 50 per cent of their income on rent? And is the minister aware that employable and unemployable welfare recipients in Ottawa are paying 50 and 54 per cent on average of their income, respectively, for housing, plus heat in many cases. Now does that really square with the minister's feeling there is no emergency which is forcing people into the situations that we describe?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, all the hon. member is doing is pointing out why there is a need for the kind of job which OHC has been doing for the last 6½ years. That's why we're in public housing: to provide for that class of people. And I repeat: By the end of this year we will be looking after more than 200,000 of those kind of people, with an increasing number every year, just to provide housing for precisely the group that the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister then take some action to find alternative means, other than Ontario Housing, for the welfare recipients who are excluded from public housing because of the quotas which are intended to keep public housing from becoming a welfare ghetto, and which makes it five times as hard—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Cassidy: —for a recipient in Ottawa to become housed than somebody who is a wage earner.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which quotas is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. Lewis: The percentage that you apply to any development.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where did you hear about that? Tell me about it; I don't know about it. There is no such thing.

Mr. Cassidy: If you didn't hear that, you had better resign right now.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the House leader—oh, he has gone. I'll leave it then.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Solicitor General has the answer to a previous question.

DELAY IN EXHUMATION

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) asked a number of questions concerning the late Frank M. Sreter Jr. His final supplementary question on May 16 was: "Mr. Speaker, will the supervising coroner make his decision known this week?" My reply then was, "The supervising coroner will make his decision when he has made a review of all the facts."

I would like to inform the House that my colleague, the Attorney General, upon my request, signed the necessary exhumation order yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

FOOD IMPORTS

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Premier.

In view of the recent announcement that food plants face big crackdowns as the United States Food and Drug Administration launches its cleanup drive—40 per cent of United States food plants are unsanitary and face seizure of their products—what steps will the government take to safeguard the health of citizens of Ontario regarding food imports from United States?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am speaking perhaps without complete knowledge, but my understanding of the law is that any imports coming into this jurisdiction are subject to the controls of the federal government, and I am sure that they will be adequately enforced. Certainly I will speak to the ministers who might have some responsibility here to check into it, but I think it is basically a matter of federal jurisdiction.

POLLUTION ON FARMS

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I have a question of the Minister of the Environment.

With reference to the warning that was given to four farmers in the Niagara-on-the-Lake area, with regard to farming practices that created a livestock aroma problem, would the minister indicate when that warning was given, what was the nature of the warning, and how come the air management branch doesn't follow up to implement it?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation, and I want to thank the hon. member for calling about it. As he

is aware, the Environmental Protection Act specifically exempts farming operations from the air management aspect of mandatory orders.

I am informed that at the last council meeting at Niagara-on-the-Lake, which was, I think, April 6, two of our engineers were there. I understand that the council had been considering the by-law for about two years, which they have now pasesd and which has to be approved by the Ontario Municipal Board.

Our people, together with the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, have been working with the farmers in the area. By and large, they have been working in the advisory way; which is the only way in which we can work. The livestock agricultural operations have conformed with the code of practice, or recommended code of practice, which we have given.

I don't know whether the hon. member has seen it, but there is a booklet put out by us and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. Some of the farmers there, I understand, have changed their systems from lagoons to holding tanks, and so forth. The problem appears to be with a relatively small number of operations.

Probably, the only way that there can be any legislative control would be through a by-law. I don't know what will transpire with the Niagara-on-the-Lake bylaw, but we have attempted to give advice to the municipality and to the farmers; and as I understand it, with success except in a relatively small number of cases.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: Does the minister agree with the contention of the lead editorial of the May 9 issue of the Farm and County, that the reason council is proceeding to implement a bylaw that will restrict all farmers—chicken, hog and beef—in expanding their operations, is because of failure to implement the warning in the instance of only three or four?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say that is probably correct.

An hon. member: Oh, it surely is very correct.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: Surely it is very anomalous that nobody did anything about this; leaving the municipality in a position of penalizing all farmers because of the acknowledged misdemeanours of four?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I understand it, the proposed bylaw will not restrict every farmer. It will restrict all farmers if they don't receive permission to expand, but the probability is that the good farmers will be able to expand.

Mr. MacDonald: There's a loophole there as big as a barn door.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

WINDSOR SENIOR CITIZENS' HOUSING

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. Will senior citizens now receiving the additional old age security and living in Ontario Housing Corp. homes be allowed to keep their additional federal revenue; or will some of it be taken away by way of increased rentals?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that question was asked a few days ago. It was answered. Will the hon. member look it up in Hansard.

Mr. B. Newman: There was no answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Tell me how I answered it if there was no answer?

Mr. B. Newman: Are you saying you are thinking of increasing their rents now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I told the hon. member that this is under consideration; the whole matter. Every time there is an adjustment—

Mr. B. Newman: That's no answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course it is. Every time there is an adjustment in the income of a person who is in geared-to-income rental housing, then all of these matters have to be considered.

I assured the hon. member that there would be no harm or injustice done to the senior citizens who might be in the position where their income might be affected due to the scale of rental in Ontario Housing. That's the only answer I can give the hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister saying he is thinking of increasing their rents?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When you are responsible for a department, you don't give off-the-top answers to such important matters.

We will have to take a look at the implications and find out what, in fact, should be done. I am sure the hon. member realizes the importance of looking into these matters in some depth. I can assure the hon. member that if, as and when there is a change in policy, I will advise this House.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West, a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Why is it not possible to state now that the increase in pensions now granted will not be violated by an increase in rent? Why can the minister not now state that as a matter of social policy?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because, Mr. Speaker, I am a responsible minister.

Mr. Lewis: Responsible, nuts! The minister raised those rents; and he is not responsible!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Don't give me any virtuous, self-righteous indignation!

Mr. Lewis: Come on, never mind self-righteous. The minister forever uses that as an example.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I thought the member agreed with geared-to-income policy.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The minister is wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it's a lot easier to make quick decisions when you are in the opposition.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member says one thing one day and something completely contradictory the next.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When you are responsible for a department, you have to make sure that the decisions you arrive at are well thought out.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Talk about self-righteous!

Mr. Lewis: Sure, like increasing property taxes.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can assure the hon. member, regardless of where my sentiments are, regardless where my good heart is and my spirit is, and—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member had better read Margaret Renwick's speeches again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —regardless of what I think may be the outcome of this consideration, I will await the proper time to make the decision and announce it, and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

SENIOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ANALYST

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you. I have a question of the provincial Treasurer.

Has the minister found a person to fill the vacancy he advertised for a person to act as a senior regional development analyst who will be a chief co-ordinator for the northern Ontario region? Has he found such a person? Where will he be located and what specifically will his duties be?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why doesn't the member for Thunder Bay apply?

Mr. Stokes: Yes; I want to know when to start.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am afraid I can't answer that, Mr. Speaker. I'll get the information.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are advertising for a candidate in York Centre.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

LEGAL AID FOR US CITIZENS

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, about the policy of supplying legal aid to American citizens charged with infractions of Canadian laws—legal aid to qualified American citizens, American residents.

Hon. Mr. Bales: This question was referred to me, or at least a similar question was re-referred to me, the other day, and I have asked for a report from the legal aid office on the matter. But it is a question of residence here as to whether one qualifies for legal aid or not. I want some further and

additional information on it, but basically it is a matter of residence.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Ruston: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. These are Michigan residents and they had received counsel from a legal aid lawyer, according to reports that I have.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Perhaps you'd assist by giving me the particulars, if you have them before you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

WINDSOR PACKERS

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I have a question of the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker.

Would the minister determine why the air management branch continues to say that Windsor packers, a meat-processing firm in Windsor, has met all the requirements of the branch with respect to air, and particularly odour pollution, when residents in the area continue to complain and are periodically nauseated by the odours emanating from this plant?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to find out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

KENORA-RAINY RIVER TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Can he indicate to the House when the study being conducted by his department on transportation in the Kenora-Rainy River areas will be completed and whether it will be a public document?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that exact date, but I will check into it and let the member know.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

SALE OF CHILDREN'S HOME PROPERTY IN HAMILTON

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health.

Has the minister's department completed its review or inquiry into the sale of the Rygiel Home?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I can't hear the member.

Mr. Deans: I am sorry. Can't he hear me?

Has the minister's department completed its inquiry into the sale of the Rygiel Home, and what assurance can he give that the home for children located in Hamilton will be maintained? I asked the question about two weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Is he familiar with it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I am not.

Mr. Deans: Can I ask it again?

Hon. Mr. Potter: He doesn't need to. I will.

Mr. Deans: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

SALE OF HOMES TO TENANTS

Mr. B. Newman: I have a question of the Minister of Revenue, Mr. Speaker.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: Can the minister tell us the status of the negotiations for the sale of the homes to the tenants in the Bridgeview subdivision in Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The last I heard of it, Mr. Speaker, they were negotiating and there were some difficulties in respect of, I believe it was the price which had been agreed upon previously. What the situation is currently I don't know.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

POLLUTION INDEX READINGS AT FALCONBRIDGE MINE

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of the Environment.

Can the minister indicate what warnings are made to or demands are made of the Falconbridge Nickel Company, when the pollution index meter at Happy Valley records readings in excess of 32 and in excess of 50?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, we notify both nickel companies when the index reaches 32, generally, from the information I have and which I think the hon. member has—I sent it to him—they voluntarily reduce at that time. When it reaches 50, we put an order on, in which case they have to reduce. I think last year we issued about half a dozen orders which stayed in effect in some cases for six hours and in some cases for perhaps 12 or 18 hours.

As I recall Falconbridge's programme is that when it reaches 32 they reduce production by 10 per cent; when it reaches 40 they reduce by another 10 per cent. When it gets to 50, they reduce by another five per cent and, of course, after it goes over 50 they shut down.

Mr. Laughren: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If that is so, could the minister explain how on April 7 and 8 it exceeded 32 for 24 consecutive hours? Could he explain how on April 14 and 15 it exceeded 32 for 28 consecutive hours? On April 15 and 16 it exceeded 32 for 23 consecutive hours, and on April 24, 25 and 26 it exceeded 50 for 22 consecutive hours and reached the high of 64. Could he explain that please?

Mr. Stokes: That's not Happy Valley, that's death valley.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I say, we don't issue an order until it exceeds 50. If there is a temperature inversion—and as I recall the various instances which the hon. member mentioned there were temperature inversions and no wind—once the SO_2 gets in the air, even if the plant shuts down, it stays there and the index stays up.

Mr. Lewis: It becomes a spiritual problem then.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Two supplementaries, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister ever been to Happy Valley? If he has, how can he allow people to live—

Mr. Reid: Which Happy Valley?

Mr. Shulman: —in that chronic odour and dust condition which those people are suffering?

Mr. Bounsall: He would be out of place in Happy Valley.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I was in Happy Valley some years ago. As I think was mentioned during my estimates debate, there have been offers to move made to the community and apparently the majority of the people wish to stay there.

Mr. Laughren: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister suggesting that when it exceeds 50 the company shuts down? Is that what he said?

Hon. Mr. Auld: When it exceeds 50 we issue an order and the order stays in effect until it gets below 50.

Mr. Laughren: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How can he say that when it will exceed 50 for 22 consecutive hours? Does he really believe it's inversion? Does he really believe that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, that's what my technical people tell me.

Mr. Shulman: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may: Why has the minister not allowed those people who are willing to move to accept the offer?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I haven't prevented them.

Mr. Shulman: He hasn't helped them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

PRESENCE OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARIES DURING ESTIMATES

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Would the Premier not think it a good thing to have the provincial secretaries present in the House during the estimates of the departments over which they have overall planning responsibility and policy co-ordination?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't really see what purpose would be served—

Mr. Reid: They would know what is going on.

Mr. Ruston: That would help.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —in them being here for the estimates. My experience has been that those ministers who are responsible for individual ministries have complete knowledge of their departments and capacity to give the answers to logical questions from the members opposite.

Mr. Reid: The Premier is going deaf.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I say I don't see really what purpose would be served. Certainly they will be here—

Mr. Reid: Give them something to do.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member is trying to rationalize something to do, I might have some observations as to the involvement of his own interests here—

Mr. Reid: For his own people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but I shall not on this occasion. It is a very pleasant day on the eve of a very pleasant weekend so I won't be provoked into that sort of discussion. I might observe, Mr. Speaker, that certainly the provincial secretaries will be here and answering questions as their own estimates are presented to the House. I really have every confidence in the ministers operating ministries to answer all of those questions that are relevant.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

BREAKOUTS FROM GIRLS' HOME

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Correctional Services, Mr. Speaker: What has gone wrong in the home formerly known as St. Euphrasia's? Why are there so many breakouts and in particular why did the mass breakout take place some 10 days ago?

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, girls do run away from time to time. It's a very open institution, as you know, and in many cases they may not be enjoying themselves there, and as a result they run away. We try to prevent it. Normally they come back, or we're able to get them and bring them back, but this happens more often when the weather gets better—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Spring fever!

Hon. Mr. Apps: It doesn't occur to the extent the member phrases it, but as the weather gets better a few seem to get a little wanderlust and some of them do leave.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's a new name for it.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister not find it unusual that the whole institution either has left or has gone on sitdown strike within such a short period of time?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I really wouldn't accept that explanation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Well, has the minister looked into it? Or, if he hasn't, will he?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I'd be very pleased to look into it for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

MOBILE HOUSING

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. Is the minister's department looking into, or has it looked into, possible minimum standards for mobile housing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This, Mr. Speaker, is not the responsibility of OHC or the Ministry of Revenue.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary of the minister: Could the minister direct me as to the department of government that would have that responsibility?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's got to be the Treasurer.

Mr. Haggerty: Make up your mind.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I look into that, Mr. Speaker? I'll look into that and find an appropriate ministry so that the hon. member can ask his question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There were several ministers with their hands up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: It will be a sad day when the Minister of Revenue hasn't a place to pass his buck.

Mr. Deans: Ho, ho, ho, ho, very nice!

An hon. member: That hurt; that hurt.

TREASURY BILLS

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the provincial Treasurer: What explanation is there for the fact that the interest rate

Ontario has to pay when it markets its Treasury bills, is rather consistently two per cent above that of the federal, and, more specifically, does Ontario market them through one dealer, or through a consortium?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'll answer the second part first: No, they're put up to tender. The tenders arrive every Tuesday morning and any member of the syndicate can tender on them. There are, in fact, 30 or 40 different firms, plus the banks and so on, of the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: "The Syndicate."

Mr. Stokes: Would the minister like to use another word?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In answer to the first part of the question: That has been widening because the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The man from the syndicate.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —federal Treasury bills are used by the banks as part of their reserves for day-to-day purposes, therefore, the yield is much less to the particular financial institution. The banks pick up the great majority of the federal Treasury bills and then use them for reserves.

Mr. MacDonald: I think it was Barber, in one of the studies of the Smith committee, who pointed to this as the reason for an unjust and excessive interest rate that has to be paid by a province like Ontario, with a good credit rating. What has been done? Has any effort been made by the provincial Treasurer to relieve the province of what in effect is a consistently two per cent extra interest charge?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, we've suggested from time to time to Mr. Benson that, for example, if he didn't want us going into the American market, what were the alternatives? In our view the Canadian market couldn't stand the pressures in some years from both the public and private sector and from the provinces and Hydro and the federal government. I'd be glad to get into this during the course of the estimates, but we've suggested for example that perhaps the Bank of Canada would support our issues. We have not specifically put forward a suggestion we should be making, that the Bank of Canada allow provincial Treasury bills to be part of the reserves of the chartered banks. I doubt very much, however, if they would take those suggestions.

Mr. MacDonald: Final supplementary: Has the provincial Treasurer given any consideration to the sale of Ontario Savings Bonds as an alternative means of raising money? They could be granted, for example, at one per cent above bank interest rates and might be the kind of thing that the people of Ontario would respond to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, we have given it consideration on several occasions. It is a very expensive way to raise money. There is a large retail force required, with a large retail commission, etc.

However, as a matter of fact, it is under consideration again.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister considered issuing bonds whose face value would be tied to the cost of living; which would be a very popular way of raising money and has been very effective in other countries?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Shulman: Well, would the minister?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, because I don't think that is the purpose of a bond. I have never heard of such a bond; and I suppose the closest thing to it would be some sort of a convertible debenture. But I hardly think we are going to convert our bonds into equity in the province.

Mr. Shulman: May I ask one more supplementary? Would the minister look into this type of bond, which has been issued so successfully in Brazil and in various European countries?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, Brazil has a rate of inflation something like 25 per cent a year; and that isn't one of our problems in this country.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

MOBILE HOUSING

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. May I redirect the question that I asked of the Minister of Revenue to the provincial Treasurer. It concerns a minimum standard for mobile housing.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What is the question?

Mr. B. Newman: Has the department developed or investigated the possibility of minimum standards for mobile housing?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, there has been quite a study under way. I think I tabled in the House not long ago, or at any rate made available to the Leader of the Opposition and others, I think, a study on the whole mobile home industry. This has been a co-operative study on the whole industry and its implications, undertaken by the former Department of Municipal Affairs, by Treasury and Economics and, I think, by the Department of Transportation and Communications. I don't know that we have given thought specifically to minimum standards for housing.

The adoption of the National Building Code, or an Ontario building code, of course, is now with the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. I think the answer specifically to your question is, no.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns today, it stand adjourned until Tuesday next.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill requires cigarette packages to bear a warning label and requires cigarette advertisements to include the warning as well as a statement of the tar and nicotine content of the cigarettes being advertised.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I think I should clarify for the members of the House that on Tuesday there will be a private members' hour. They were notified by communication.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 27th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HEALTH
(continued)

On vote 2301:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2301, page 302. The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of issues I'd like to raise with the minister, and they relate to policy. They are related themselves and yet they are separate issues; I think the estimates would be the tidiest place to raise them. I might say to the minister that they flow from the information and the experience we are having in my own area of York in an effort to establish a community service centre.

For the information of the House, and without going into the detail of it, I would just say this is a centre that seeks to bring together to a considerable extent under one roof, or at least in very close working relationship, the delivery of services of all of the existing social agencies and to add to it the health component, mental, physical and dental.

The issues I wanted to raise with the minister are briefly these: First, if the regulations of the Mental Health Act are now going to be implemented—regulations that were established in 1968, I think—that in a psychiatric unit at a hospital there must be established a sort of community base for the delivery of the services, I am a little puzzled as to what exactly is the government's position with regard to what I think is a necessary redirection of funds.

If you are going to take out into the community a significant proportion of the delivery of those services—which we all agree is desirable—it seems to me that money that might hitherto have been directed to the psychiatric unit all of which was within the hospital, should now be delivered to the community and to any centre, whether it be strictly a mental health centre or whether it be co-ordinated with the delivery of other services.

I find, as I try to assess the co-ordination process that is slowly emerging between health, social and family services and education, that there doesn't seem to be any apparent answer there. I think it is a general

question for the future, but it also has specific relationship to those hospitals which may already have been granted, in principle, the authority for establishing a psychiatric unit or expanding an existing one; they are sort of caught midstream.

That is my first question; I don't know whether the minister wants to deal with them individually or whether I can give them seriatim, since they relate, and perhaps he can deal with them as a package.

The second one has to do with the delivery of physical medical services per se. I would just like to bring the minister up to date on a situation which I suspect is fairly common in urban areas. For example, in our preparatory work for developing this centre in the borough of York, we have discovered—somewhat to our surprise—that there are as many as 195 doctors with professional addresses in York. Now some of those will be specialists who aren't available for what might be described as regular or family practice; some of them are on hospital staff. But even when that number is taken away from the total of 195, there are still enough doctors to provide what might be described as family practice services, primary medical services, to every person in the borough of York.

Now in the survey which is presently being conducted we will find out with a greater degree of certainty exactly how many families don't have a family doctor. As the minister knows, in the Parkdale survey they found 42 per cent didn't have family doctors, and what that percentage is in York it will be very interesting to find out. But even when we have found out—and it may well be, with 195 doctors in the area, that it will be much lower than 42 per cent—I don't think one can ignore the fact that the overall picture will hide certain areas where there is a serious deficiency.

There are, if I may put it another way, great pockets of unmet medical needs. I am told—and this is at this point only a guess—that for example in one area of the borough, at the corner of Jane and Woolner, where you presumably have a nest of eight highrise apartments and presumably 2,500, 3,000, 4,000 people, 80 per cent of the families in there haven't a family doctor.

It also relates to the problem of changing practice. In the survey results it is interesting to note the number of doctors who state that they operate on a 9 to 4 basis in their office, or a 9 to 5 basis—and of course everybody is aware of how difficult it is today to get a doctor to make a house call.

In short, there are areas where a great number of families simply do not have primary medical services, whatever the reason for it. This is creating another problem, as the minister I am sure is painfully aware, and that is that emergency departments in hospitals are becoming the source for primary medical services.

In fact, I was interested to discover from the administrator of the Humber Memorial Hospital that they did a study of the intake in their emergency ward two years ago, and they are going to repeat the study now. The results two years ago showed that 50 per cent of the people weren't coming for emergencies at all, but were coming for what might be described as primary medical needs. This is (a) because they haven't got a family doctor; and (b) because they can't get doctors to make house calls; and all the other complex of reasons that relate to the delivery of services. The result is that it may well be, in establishing a community centre such as we are contemplating in York, that there will be need for a medical component within that centre, but conceivably not very large in numbers because we already have 195 doctors and I am painfully aware of the minister's preoccupation with not duplicating costs when it is unnecessary. Maybe the problem is—and this is what I address to the minister, as well as what is being done generally and what is the policy generally—maybe the problem and maybe the function of a centre such as this is to try to bring together the citizens who haven't got a regular doctor and at least those doctors who indicate that they are interested in further patients? Now, this seems so elementary, and one would wonder, in a free society, why it would have to be done, but I am convinced that that is a major problem. We have theoretically, at least in urban areas, all the medical services that are needed, but in practice the people who need them don't get them. This, of course, is the preoccupation of the government and everybody who is interested in it, and you are reexamining the whole process of the delivery of health services.

I made my comment in specific reference to doctors. Let me switch briefly now to the dental side of it, which is in one sense even more ludicrous. I was almost taken aback to discover that out of the 7,000 dentists in Canada, one quarter of them—about 1,700 are in Metropolitan Toronto. When I absorbed that statistic I then proceeded and by simple arithmetic came to the conclusion that on a population basis, again speaking of my own area, we should have

had about 115 dentists out of the 1,700 in the Metropolitan area, on a straight per capita population basis. In fact we have 48; so we have one half of the average throughout the Metro area. But that's only the beginning of the picture of maldistribution. When you take a look at the York map and you plot where the dentists are, 20 of them are up and down Bathurst St., which is the eastern boundary of York, and another 10 lie east of Dufferin. So you have 30 of the 48 in the eastern third of the borough. You have another eight up in Weston. You have another one way down on the southern Baby Point Rd.; and in the great heart of the borough, west of Dufferin, throughout the whole of Earlscourt-Silverthorne, Black Creek, Runnymede and Mount Dennis area, there are only nine dentists.

An hon. member: You've got more in one block than I have in the whole riding.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I grant you the intervention of the hon. member is a very valid one. He is dealing with the opposite side of the coin. In northern areas and in some of the rural areas of Ontario, we are not getting medical and dental services, because you haven't got the people.

In Metropolitan Toronto we have got the professionals, and we are not getting the service.

So if you will bear with me, I am not ignoring his even-worse situation, in a sense; we at least have resources presumably to work with. But it is at least more anomalous that in an area where you have got 195 doctors, or where you have got a quarter of the whole country's dentists working in the Metro area that there should be nobody going without medical and dental services at all; for one moment. But they are; and therefore we are back to the problem of delivery.

That's the third point I wanted to raise with the minister and ask him if he has any thoughts on it. I'm not asking him to be Solomon and come up with the answers spontaneously this morning.

The final one is one that we began to discuss last night in the estimates of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. The minister was dealing with the Mustard report, which is one of the monographs prepared by the Ontario Health Council.

I had forgotten, or perhaps I never knew, that the recommendation of the Mustard report is that we should not consider in the Province of Ontario moving towards the building of a sixth or a seventh medical school; but rather we should concentrate, or we should place our emphasis on the integration of education and health delivery; or the delivery of integrated health and education and services.

Now this really rang bells with me and evoked an immediately very favourable response. But I asked this question to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities: To what extent is the moneys that they might be putting into a sixth or a seventh medical school, being directed towards this; being directed towards the integration and the delivery of health, education and services.

His answer was that this was a recent report; it's a policy issue; and they are only considering it.

Okay. I think this brings it back at least half, if not 60 per cent into the bailiwick of the Minister of Health.

If your problem is a shortage of family doctors, and if there is a highly commendable and a most encouraging recognition in the medical schools and certain departments of the medical schools, the need for switching away from specialization back to family practice; it then seems to me that there is very great opportunity, not only in what might be called university cities, which are close at hand to the medical schools, but even for medical schools to establish satellites.

As the Minister of Colleges and Universities indicated last night, McMaster is considering this proposal vis-à-vis Windsor. I mean, as far away as Windsor.

There is a very great possibility of developing family practice clinics, or what you will, that will be partly for teaching purposes and at the same time will be meeting some of these great unmet needs; or pockets of unmet needs. For example, the range of 42 per cent of the people in the Parkdale area who haven't got a family physician.

And it is my guess—and for the moment I've only sort of become aware of this and I don't pretend to have examined all ramifications of it. But it is my guess that the amount of money that might have been put into a sixth medical school, if put into this kind of thing, would turn out infinitely more beneficial. In short, instead of having millions of dollars of capital expenditure going to a new medical school, the same number of dollars would go much, much further in terms of the relatively small capital requirements; or whatever is the most important kind of requirement to assist in the development of

family practices that would provide both an opportunity for teaching and at the same time would be meeting the unmet medical needs in areas where they haven't got doctors like the north. Or in the pockets in the urban areas where we haven't got family services available in sufficient quantity.

Those are the four areas I would like to raise with the minister. I would appreciate any reaction he has at this point.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, the first item concerning funding, of course, is a matter to which we are now giving very serious consideration, to decide how the funds that the member suggested were hospital-oriented before should be used at the local clinic level. I know the hon. member is aware that our thinking is very much the same along these lines and we want to develop our health facilities to serve the needs of the community.

It was with this in mind that we have been experimenting with the district health council concept. We want the district health council set up on the basis of planning the needs for a particular community or district. It is along these lines that the hon. member has been planning this project in York South. I am confident that—

Mr. MacDonald: The borough of York! Don't cut it short because it includes the Humber. I don't want to get into trouble.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The borough of York, rather! As the project is developed I know that we are going to learn a great deal from it. I am sure, as time goes on, month by month we will learn more and more about how it should be developed. Then we will be in a position to apply this to other areas of the province.

I must confess that I am not as concerned about the apparent shortage of medical and dental facilities in this particular area as I am in other areas of the province where we have no facilities. I am much more concerned, at the present time, with trying to make available to the people in these areas some sort of service which they don't get today at all.

In the particular area the member is interested in, I can appreciate his particular concern but at the same time, with transportation being what it is today, these people do have service. They can get to it if they have to, but it is not available in many other areas.

Mr. MacDonald: It's not the shortage, it's the maldistribution.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, that's what I understand. I appreciate that. On the Mustard report, again, as far as I'm concerned, we're giving it very serious consideration. I agree wholeheartedly with this report as far as establishing more medical schools is concerned.

It is not an easy matter to establish a medical school. It takes at least 10 years and it must be established in an area where the clinical material is available in addition to having people well qualified to train. The other thing we must appreciate is that the majority of medical schools over the years have become specialist-oriented and this isn't our problem. We have too damn many specialists as it is today and we need to concentrate more on training family physicians.

I welcome the suggestion from the hon. member and the Mustard report in which they suggest—as I have mentioned on many occasions—that we take advantage of the vast reservoir of clinical material which is available throughout the community hospitals around the province. At the present time, we are asking our universities to become interested and to insist that 60 per cent of their graduates—or, at least work toward having at least 60 per cent of the graduates—become interested in family practice.

There have been several suggestions presented to me by members of the profession and by some of the teaching profession. They have come up with proposals on how we might encourage people to take up family practice as a profession rather than specializing. The Mustard report is only one of them. Another suggestion has been the preceptorships which have been going on for several years now, in which residents spend several months in the summer working with family physicians throughout the province. Another suggestion has been that all physicians be required to practice for at least two years in family practice before they would be considered for post-graduate training.

I've had some of the teaching staff at Toronto University tell me that in their experience these individuals are much more capable and appreciate to a far greater degree the problems that family physicians are faced with than those who go directly from university into their internship residency; so they continue their training without getting out into practice.

Another suggestion was that all graduates —as part of their training, as a matter of fact —once they graduate, be required to serve a period of a year or two in some of the

more remote areas of the province where it is difficult to get physicians to locate—and not to isolate them but to send them in pairs, so there would be at least two couples located in an area.

The suggestion by this one individual was that undoubtedly we would find a fair percentage of the physicians would make a decision to stay there, because they would like the country life, the freedom they have there, the fishing, hunting, sports and everything else that went with it.

One of the problems brought up in the OMA meeting a week ago was that it's not so much a matter of getting the doctors to go there but it's getting their wives to go and locate in these areas. And, as one chap said to me, "If we could just get them to go there, I am sure that once they are there, many of them would decide to stay."

These are all matters that we are looking at now—the professions, the college, the OMA, myself and the universities. We are getting together and discussing these, and hopefully with other groups and individuals like yourself we will get the answers. We are not going to do it overnight, but we are working toward it.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 1 carry?

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, are we still on vote 2301?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but we are taking it by items—items 1, 2, 3 and so on.

Mr. Dukszta: I am a bit lost at the moment —oh yes, it is still on the same one.

Mr. Chairman: Okay.

Mr. Dukszta: My comments really are in reference to the remarks of both the hon. member for York South and the minister. I was quite fascinated by the suggestion that it is within possibility—I am not sure whether the minister was really flying sort of a trial balloon on the idea—the graduates of the medical schools could in fact serve one to two years in the northern provinces. Probably, I imagine, it would require some change both in the policy of the College of Physicians and Surgeons besides a legislative change.

My first question is whether, in fact, that is a suggestion or is the minister considering legislation? It is an interesting way of doing it and probably would solve many of the problems if we worked within the present system of physician distribution.

I must congratulate the member for York South and the minister for being involved in this really exciting project in the borough of York, in which all the social services are being integrated fairly consistently into one comprehensive centre. I like the idea. The question is whether this is a pilot project and if the minister has any further ideas of expanding this sort of approach into other areas. Or will he wait until the community itself begins the action as was the case in the area in my colleague's riding.

I would also like to ask a couple of questions about the Mustard report. If I heard the minister correctly, he said he likes the Mustard report more than the recommendations from the Ontario Council of Health or the report of the Committee on the Healing Arts, both of which have suggested that there should be another medical school built in Ontario.

I personally believe that we don't need so much to train more physicians the way they have been trained so far, but to train them differently or to expand our facilities to produce a completely different type of individual to provide the primary medical care in this province. It's the type of education we have been providing to physicians which is so much at fault at the moment, and we have to look very seriously at whether in fact we can, simply by voluntary effort like this, both reverse the drift of the physicians to the cities from the rural parts and reverse the drift of the physicians from primary care to specialization. If you look at the figures—and it's very significant to go back maybe something like 17 years—17 years ago in Canada 67 per cent of general practitioners were in fact in primary care work. Now, I think, less than half are in the primary care area. So can we really reverse it right now by voluntary effort? It would be a very serious change in the present practice. Because medical education has not caught up with the demands of the medical practice and the physicians naturally fall into a pattern of going into specialization, we'll need a fairly intensive effort to stop this.

I think the McMaster programme is fascinating, with a tremendous potential. If I'm correct, they want to extend their training facilities for their physicians to the northern provinces, not by setting up another school but by sending some of their graduates to do work there. I think it's fantastic, and I find this very, very valuable, within the context of the present system.

The Mustard report says that if we extend all our facilities in the schools and change some of the modes of teaching, we can probably provide enough primary care physicians for this province. But if you look at the last Ontario Council of Health report, they are very concerned that almost 50 per cent of our newly-licensed physicians actually come from outside Ontario, partly from Canada and also from other countries. It will be a dangerous point when this supply will dry out, and it may dry out due to changed financial and economic circumstances in the country of origin of the physicians, or may change because of the change of policy here. We must not rely entirely on those doctors, as we rely right now. If you look at the lower echelons of the medical practice in hospitals, especially the large metropolitan non-teaching hospitals, you find that they are often staffed entirely by people from outside this province, in fact, from European universities or even the Asiatic universities. So, we rely very intensely on this.

To return again to this point, the Mustard report suggests that if we only change the nature of practice and expand our present facilities we can both correct the inequitable distribution of the physicians in the province and also make sure that the physicians are more interested and stay longer in the primary care practice.

I really do think that it's probably unfeasible without seriously changing the whole role of the physician. But since this is not in the offing—and I don't really want to speak of the ancillary para-medical or substitutive services for physicians, as I did in my opening speech to the Health estimates—we must think what incentives could be produced for physicians to stay in primary care and what kind of pressure the minister can exert on the medical schools to change their curricula and move closer to the McMaster model, because I'm certain that this has not happened and is not happening in the University of Toronto. I have enough close contact with the university to know that there is now a strong tension between the two opposing polarities of teaching medicine; one in the University of Toronto and one in McMaster. Maybe the minister has some information which will suggest that this is not so, that we are moving towards a more acceptable, and maybe more agonizing, appraisal of what is the education of a physician and what kind of physicians we should produce?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think we should. I would like to clarify that these were purely suggestions. I don't want it to be considered for one minute that they were decisions which had been made by the department. These were purely suggestions that had been handed down to me by many people as alternatives to how these things could be handled.

As far as the projects are concerned, the project that the hon. member for York South is presenting for the York area is one of several which we hope to have under way this year as projects to determine the best method of dealing with these matters. I think I am on record as saying before in this House that it may well be that each one is going to have to be developed to serve the specific needs of that area. I doubt very much if we are going to be able to say that we can develop the concept so that we can drop into any area anywhere in the province without making changes in it.

I don't think the Mustard report and the recommendations of the Ontario Council of Health and the Committee on the Healing Arts vary that much. They all appreciate the need—all of us appreciate the need—for training more medical personnel in the province, particularly family physicians. The Mustard report really suggests that we maximize the use of our present facilities. What they are saying is that we must find viable and useful alternatives to constructing another large teaching centre. This would be to use the facilities we now have to their maximum and then provide the satellites for clinical material.

Already Western University has been in discussion with Windsor to use them in this manner. Already McMaster University has been talking with Thunder Bay along the same lines; I am hopeful that we can get Queen's University talking with other areas along this line. In doing this I am confident we can almost double the intake of our universities at the present time, taking advantage of the facilities we have now without getting into a tremendous capital expenditure. As the hon. member for York South has said, we could divert some of these funds to develop the teaching facilities in these other areas. It is not going to be that great an amount of money that will be required to do this sort of thing.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I wonder if I could go on somewhat on this topic, Mr. Chairman, and recall to the minister's attention that when we were last discussing the

estimates the other night—and today the former speaker just touched on it—my concern primarily at the moment is for northwestern Ontario and specifically two communities in my riding, Rainy River and Ignace.

I think the minister is well aware that for a considerable length of time, Rainy River which already has a hospital, has a facility, has been unable to attract a doctor for various reasons. We were most hopeful that we would get a doctor there. I understand that there is a good possibility that there will be one in Rainy River by the end of July.

I believe the minister has Ignace in mind to be a satellite area, with a satellite type of clinic. My concern really is this—what kind of a timetable are we talking about in regard to the plans of McMaster or Windsor or whoever else is involved in this programme before we can actually see some concrete results? Can the minister indicate what kind of time levels we are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We are not working to any timetable; we are working as fast as we can. We keep pushing and pushing and trying to get these under way as you are obviously aware. It is not an easy matter to say, "Okay, we can get a doctor to Ignace or Rainy River as of the end of July." We get them there just as fast as we possibly can. I can assure you that everybody in the department is moving as quickly as they can these days.

Mr. Reid: Just one or two more comments, if I may, then. I appreciate that the minister is doing his best in this regard. I wonder, for those of us who live in the north, we are often at a loss to understand why we can attract doctors and dentists to our area when we don't always have the amenities of the city. This is true, but where the pace of living is a little more relaxed and there are certain other benefits of the outdoors—fishing and hunting, the clean air, fresh water, and so on. And I wonder if the minister can indicate really why have we not been able to attract these people. Is it a matter of attitude? Have we been approaching—and perhaps McMaster is and Windsor is—and all of us are approaching this problem in the wrong way.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Maybe my crystal ball has the answer to that one, Mr. Chairman, because I sure haven't. It says here — my sources say no. Frankly that is a $64 question isn't it?

We offer guaranteed incomes to individuals to locate in that area. At the present time I believe the guaranteed income for physicians to locate in an area such as yours is $33,000 a year.

You say you have got all the other amenities there, and I am confident that you have. If anybody can come up with a reason, as you have said, why people don't want to locate there; I don't know. Surely there must be people in the area who want to train as physicians; who would be prepared to train and go back there.

One of the things that we have found in assisting some doctors from outside of the country to come from their own homeland and to come here and train; once they get here they don't want to go back. We find the same thing from the northern part of the province. In many cases individuals from there, once they train, don't want to go back. I would like to have the answer, too. I am afraid I haven't got the solution.

Mr. Reid: Am I right in supposing that Rainy River will have a doctor by June or July? Perhaps we could get a nod to this under the—

Hon. Mr. Potter: He says yes.

Mr. Reid: Thank you.

Hon. Mr Potter: I think you should know that so far since we instituted the service programme we have located 48 doctors in municipalities in the northern parts of the province.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, upon reflection, I want to pick up some of the comments of the minister's in which he said that he is not so much interested in the problems in an area such as for example, the urban communities where they have got enough doctors or dentists, as he is in the problems of the north. Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Not problems; what I was referring to was the shortage.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, but what we are talking about is the failure to deliver a basic service to the people. We are talking about in the context that we are spending $2 billion and the people aren't getting the service; and obviously something is fundamentally wrong.

Now, the point I want to make—and I want to keep it in perfect balance—as top priority I would agree in an area where they

haven't got adequate doctors, or grossly inadequate doctors or dentists—in fact in sometimes zero numbers; so its inadequacy couldn't be any greater; that is top priority. But I don't think we can ignore the other, because it is even more anomalous.

Let me pick figures out of thin air. There may be 25 per cent of the population in the rural areas in the north of Ontario who aren't getting adequate medical and dental services because they haven't got the doctors and the dentists in the community. But what is rather shattering, when you stop to consider it, is the other 75 per cent. There is a significant proportion of them in areas where we've got, on a per capita basis, the greatest concentration of doctors in Canada; or the greatest concentration of dentists in Canada; and they too are not getting the service; or a significant and inexcusable proportion of the people in that part of the province aren't getting it.

So that while we lay our emphasis in the first instance in getting doctors and dentists and paramedical personnel into areas where they haven't any at all, I think we have really got to take a look at the inadequacies of a delivery system which results in people not getting what they are entitled to in spite of the fact that all of the skills are there, sometimes in very great abundance.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: I realize that in northern areas, Mr. Chairman, the inequitable distribution of physicians is a major problem. I would hate to suggest that the areas which at the moment have no physicians should settle for someone else, when everyone else can get a physician. But so many of our services which are being done now by physicians—if you use as an example from other countries like Great Britain—are done by other people, by other professions, by other personnel; often with very credible if not better results for the overall health care.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I have no reservations about suggesting something like that.

Mr. Dukszta: In Great Britain they use midwives, generally through the country, to provide prenatal and deliver most of the normal deliveries, usually, the second, third and fourth child. The first one quite often is delivered in hospital by a physician.

In spite of the minister's avowal that the department really hasn't got that much power to introduce new problems and change the policy, I would say the department has a lot of power. I would not quite buy the fact that you have to negotiate with the community and the organized bodies to such an extent.

I was wondering whether the minister has considered, in any sense, as part of the substitution for another medical school, introducing major training programmes for midwives, for other ancillary workers or for mental health technicians. They would provide ancillary services for the physician and if necessary, work also as substitutes for physicians in areas where there are, in fact, no medical services provided.

I also realize that the attitudes in this country are such—I have met this consistently when I have been speaking on the point of substituting a midwife or a nurse clinician for a physician—the attitudes of the people at large are such that they think it is a second-class service. Even to suggest it means that you will be differentiating between people who can afford it or people who are close to a doctor and will get the first-class service, and the people who will have to go to a nurse clinician or a midwife or otherwise for their services. Is there anything in the programmes of the Ministry of Health at the moment, or in the offing which will give priority to training these ancillary and substitutive people?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Chairman. On many occasions in the past few months and I think in the House, too, I have already stated that we are very interested in developing paramedical personnel—both paramedical and paradental personnel. We are in the process now of preparing legislation, a new health disciplines Act in which all this will be outlined. A great deal of consideration is being given to this and we are exploring more and new methods of health delivery all the time.

Mr. Dukszta: Is it possible to ask the minister to give a little more detail because it probably will foreshorten some of my questions later if he gives me some hint of what he means by the new Act and what kind of disciplines will be involved?

Hon. Mr. Potter: What we are trying to do is determine what types of assistants should be trained, what their training should be, what their qualifications should be and what their responsibilities would be. At the

present time in the province we have nurse assistants working with doctors in some of the less populated areas, trying to determine how effective they can be in making house calls and so on, relieving doctors to do other types of specialized care.

At the same time we are experimenting with other types of assistants in the way of orthopædic assistants who are trained and will be trained and qualified not only to remove casts but to apply casts and so on. I am quite confident that many of these—we have them now although they are not recognized and at the present time it must be done under very close supervision.

As far as I am concerned, there are many such well-qualified persons in some hospitals. They call them by different names—orderlies, assistants and so on—but really they are orthopædic assistants who are trained to remove casts, see that the x-rays are taken and after properly recorded, put casts back on. These individuals, with training, are very capable of putting on casts. In many instances, I would sooner have them do it.

As you are well aware there are many other areas in which we have been using assistants for some time. All of these will include—I guess there must be 20 or 25 when we get into lab technicians, dental technicians, and whether we should have a dental technologist. All these will be spelled out in the new legislation, with the educational qualifications, training requirements, licensing, and so on.

Mr. Dukszta: The whole concept and idea that the minister is thinking of really excites me; that he is going to introduce, in fact, an Act to cover this. Could I ask the minister then, if it is again not being too much forward looking, what are the numbers he is talking about? Is he proceeding with it—oh, he is not sure about that yet.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: When the member for York South was talking about the need for a more efficient distribution of the medical personnel in certain areas, particularly down here, I made a rapid calculation of the number of doctors. My riding is about 110,000 square miles and I know all of the doctors in it. The largest number I can come up with is 15 doctors for 110,000 square miles. We have four dentists in 110,000 square miles. I think we have one psychiatrist who is available in all of northwestern Ontario, I am told. I have had several complaints, particularly from small school boards who would like the services of a psychiatrist to come in and make an assessment of children, not only children with learning disabilities—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Is it the teacher who needs it?

Mr. Stokes: —but an assessment has to be made to see how they could be helped. I am no expert in the field, but they tell me that it takes at least a year to get a psychiatrist to come in and make an assessment, or even to make an appointment with the one psychiatrist who is available to do that kind of work on behalf of the Ontario Department of Health. I am wondering if the minister, once he is able to attract the kind of trained people that we need up there, will consider mobile clinics, both dental and medical, to travel around on a regular basis—I don't know whether it will be once a month or once every three months, but on a regular basis—to assure these people that at regular intervals throughout the year they will at least be exposed to somebody they can consult with and be assured of getting expert treatment. Apart from the mobile clinics, where we have a road structure where they can get in and out on a regular basis, I wonder if, in other areas that aren't covered by the services of the Department of National Health and Welfare, you can have a flying doctor service, a flying ambulance service. I know of many, many instances where people have died because they weren't able to get the services they required. That is all there was to it. It wasn't possible to get them out. I realize that weather is a problem. When you are talking about fiying medical personnel into remote areas or flying people out, you do have to contend with the weather and there is nothing we can do about that. But, to the greatest extent possible, does the minister envisage this kind of service in the omnibus bill which he is bringing in to deal with trained medical people and paramedical people? I am wondering if the minister would care to comment on that as something that is needed because of geography and isolation.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Of course this is something that has to be considered for that part of the province. I don't think there is any other way we are going to be able to get facilities in there except on a mobile basis in many cases. As far as the omnibus bill that we are bringing in is concerned, one of the things I would like to see established is that we have properly trained nurse-practitioners in many of these com-

munities, where she can be in direct communication with the nearest hospital. She can transmit electrocardiograms and so forth over the wire to the hospital and receive advice from the physician there, who can determine whether or not he can advise her by phone, or whether he should have somebody fly in, or whether they should fly the patient out. I think this is one of the things that has to be considered. It is one of the reasons I am so interested in paramedical personnel, particularly for these areas of the province.

I think that when you are talking about the need for psychiatrists and psychologists in the area, in so many cases that we have learned over the past years, when we are talking about the retarded, they aren't really mentally retarded in many cases; they are perceptually handicapped individuals who haven't been properly diagnosed in the first place. You are no doubt aware of the eye van that the ophthalmologists now have available. It's going to start going out in the northern part of the province where it will be manned by an ophthalmologist. Ophthalmologists will be taking turns, I understand, in providing this service. These are the things that we have to promote in a sense to make sure that they do get into these areas of the province, and we are definitely interested in this proposal.

Mr. Stokes: I want to say something of a very specific nature. I think it falls within the $46 million for the health resources development plan. I would like to read a letter that I got, just about a week ago. It says:

> In November, 1971 the Lakehead Victorian Order of Nurses extended its nursing services to cover the Nipigon, Red Rock and Dorion area. We find that providing this area with service has proven to be quite costly. Each month there is approximately a $250-cost over fees collected. The community will be approached immediately for financial support.
>
> In order to provide this service to the areas of northwestern Ontario is there any possibility of receiving a grant from your level of government. Hoping to hear from you soon.

The letter is signed by a David Allen, who is chairman of the extension committee of the Victorian Order of Nurses, I guess it is.

I am wondering is there any money in this estimate for that? Do you, in fact, subsidize the Victorian Order of Nurses, or is there any way in which you can, in order to provide this much needed service to people who are incapacitated and need nursing home care, but there are no nursing homes in that area?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It would come under the health resources development plan. That is certainly a development programme. Assistance of this nature comes through our home-care programmes. In that area, we haven't got a home care programme, but this would be assistance, that would come under the Hospital Insurance Plan. We can provide assistance there, if it is needed. The home-care programmes, as you know, in most areas of the province have contracted with the Victorian Order of Nurses to do the home care under their guidance. Then they are funded through the home-care programme.

Mr. Stokes: But there are funds available?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh yes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question. Has he given any consideration to a computerized medical system in Ontario? I believe it has been followed in some states in the United States and it has worked out very successful. I think, perhaps using such a system as this, perhaps the person involved who needs medical help could fill out a card with a list of check marks, the usual questions asked when you go to see the family doctor. Perhaps this could be operated through a system whereby he could fill out a card and then send it into any doctor, or even send it into a government agency here in Toronto. From there on, they could pick out and tell the person that he had better see a physician immediately, in this line.

There are insurance companies that have medical records of persons here in Ontario. There are hospitals that have records of persons. There are physicians that have records of histories of persons. I think even the government has a number of medical records, dealing with persons in the province of Ontario. I was just wondering if perhaps this might assist a person with immediate medical care in this sense that he can fill this card out and send it in to the government, to the medical health services here, and from there on he can be advised to see a doctor on any problem that deals with his medical history itself.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We have at the present time a committee which is set up of so-called experts within the computer field that is functioning with the hospitals and the university people trying to determine what is the best approach to this. There is no question about it; with computers as they are today, information on all of us, as far as our health is concerned, could be banked in computers. It would be a very simple matter, when a patient comes into a doctor's office to press a few buttons and within a matter of seconds to have a complete history on that patient. This would save a terrific amount of time for both the physician and others, but at the same time it brings up the problem of confidentiality. And this is one matter we are looking at at the present time: to determine how this can be done and still protect the confidential nature of much of this information if it is made available through a computer.

As you are aware, I think it is Searle that has one of these computerized outfits where a patient sits down in front of a panel and presses a few buttons in answer to questions that appear on the screen in front of him. And within a few minutes you get a tentative diagnosis or some information that is passed on to the physician, so that when he does his laboratory work that again can be computerized; then, with his physical examination, he comes up with a pretty quick diagnosis. I suppose if we look far enough ahead we might eventually see the day when you walk into a booth at the end of the street, press a few buttons and have the pills come out of the side of the box and you're on your way.

Mr. Haggerty: Well, the records can be protected by proper supervision though, can't they? But I think the reason they are getting into it in the United States is that many persons perhaps will go to two doctors; from one they get a prescription for a certain drug, then they go to the next physician who gives then another drug, and they find out that between the two drugs it is going to add further complications. This was one way that it could be checked.

Hon. Mr. Potter: As a matter of fact, we can go much further than that in Ontario. We can beat the Americans on that. I think there was one case where the person had 11 complete physical examinations within a 12-month period, by 11 different doctors in the province. As you say, we could stop a lot of this nonsense—

Mr. Haggerty: He hasn't much confidence in the medical profession in Ontario, you may say.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Obviously not. He was looking for the answer he wanted.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, maybe we should in fact sacrifice some element of confidentiality to make sure that this type of duplication doesn't occur. But maybe the minister has answered this question already, but I am not quite clear as to what the health development plan and the $46 million proposed is actually all about.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He did answer it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I did answer that the other night to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I gave him a list—it will be in Hansard—a complete list of all the projects.

Mr. Dukszta: It will be in Hansard?

Mr. Lewis: By way of a question on that development plan, Mr. Chairman. I was sitting under the gallery at the time the minister was enumerating the items included in the $46 million. If memory serves me correctly, there was not a single item which applied to northern Ontario in the health resources programme as he set it out.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That was the capital programme?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, the entire capital programme.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, there wasn't.

Mr. Lewis: Can you indicate why that would be the case, or how that works out?

Hon. Mr. Potter: These were all associated with teaching centres, and we just haven't got any teaching centres in the northern part of the province at the present time. Now this will be expanded, as we were saying here earlier. If we adopt this principle, hopefully, of using satellites in various parts of the province, then this will be extended into those areas. We'll use these funds for that.

Mr. Stokes: Talking about the satellites, is that in conjunction with the McMaster plan that you are trying to get off the ground? I think you indicated in a recent trip up north to the Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay

areas that you were thinking about putting in facilities for training doctors on the spot—for a period of time at least.

If that is the case and there is no money in here for capital expenditures, it is obvious that nothing tangible is going to happen this year, if in fact you'll ever do anything in that regard in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Potter: These are just the ones that have been approved. There will be others; the funds are there. The ones we have mentioned here are the ones that have been approved to date. We are getting applications in all the time for assistance under this health resources development fund, and they are being examined and checked over locally as well as in other areas of the province. As they are approved, they'll be added to the list.

Mr. Lewis: If memory serves me again, your list of capital requirements amounted to $40 million and your list of operating requirements amounted to $6 million. You said it almost with defiance, and adding them together it comes to $46 million; and is that not the total estimate?

What I am really saying is that if the $46 million is the total estimate, the projects that have thus far been approved and are covered by those sums are the projects for this year, and my colleague from Thunder Bay is entirely correct. There may well be moneys or additional revenues next year, but for this year, until March 31, 1973, that's it. That's it for the north and that's it for the south. It's a little more palatable for the south than for the north, let it be pointed out.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, the minister has much less than the year before, by almost $10 million. Does this mean that he has been cutting down on this type of project? It is $10 million less than last year.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have an answer for the last question that was asked, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The only reductions that I know of are the usual constraints that we have had all the way through in all departments on expenditures this year. We've had it here as well.

Mr. Dukszta: There is a $10 million reduction so you are saying, in fact, you have to reduce some of the programmes?

The second question is how far has the McMaster programmes actually gone? Is it now accepted and going ahead or is it still tentative? I understood from a discussion at the university with the people there that it is, in fact, very tentative. Will it come in this year, next year or when?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The basic science building at McMaster University will be opened within a week, seven or eight days. We haven't given final approval yet to the project that they are recommending, that they have been working on for the north part of the province. It is still in the study stage but I would suggest that by the fall we will have something in operation.

Mr. Dukszta: I am sorry, I am not quite clear, Mr. Minister. By the fall you will have some idea of when you are going ahead or—

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would hope that by the fall we will be going ahead.

Mr. Stokes: Since you haven't got any money allocated in this year's expenditures for physical facilities in the north, I am wondering will the minister not consider what is being done I think it is by the University of Toronto, the Sick Children's Hospital and the Department of National Health and Welfare whereby they fly specialists, the tops in the country I would think, into many remote areas?

One month you will have an ear, eye, nose and throat specialist. Then they will have a neurologist and the following month they will have something else. As a result of this programme which has been undertaken with those three groups many far north communities have been exposed to a kind of medical delivery system that would be the envy of a good many places down here in the heavily urbanized centres. But that isn't the case with the northern areas of the province which are the responsibility of the province.

I am wondering, in the absence of establishing something of a permanent nature, would the minister mind enlisting the aid and the co-operation of a lot of these top people? Give them a little fishing trip, say to them in the morning they can go fishing in a virgin stream and then in the afternoon give them a chance to look over these people, and give them the opportunity to be exposed to top medical people in the way it is being done in other areas farther north.

If you give me anything to take back to these people it will be better than nothing or saying, "We're studying it and hopefully we'll be able to find some money." Out of $46 million, not one penny of it is being spent on facilities to train people in the north

whether it be a flying doctor, a flying ambulance, a mobile clinic, a dental facility or a medical facility. At least give us something to go on until your plans are firm. I don't want to pursue it unduly but it seems to me that we have to have something to allay the fears of these people in the north, and that something tangible is going to happen.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, we don't need any capital expenditure to do what you are talking about. I'm talking about capital expenditure and we are talking about extending the training facilities—

Mr. Stokes: That's what I say, what else are you going to do in lieu of capital?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The other thing we are going to do is what we have been talking about all along. We have a plan that is being developed to provide, as you suggested earlier, mobile clinics, mobile doctors—flying, if you like; whatever you want to call it. The funds are in the health plan to do this. This has got nothing to do with this vote at all, but—

Mr. Stokes: And that will begin when?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is coming. I am not going to say tomorrow; I am not going to say next week or next month but it will begin this year.

Mr. Lewis: You will stand or fall on that statement.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: If I understand correctly, Mr. Minister, the extension of the teaching facilities from McMaster to Thunder Bay will not involve any capital expenditure?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I didn't say that at all. What I said was that it would involve capital expenditure, yes. Some. But that is different from providing the type of service we are talking about for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Dukszta: I am perfectly well aware of what you said but I am saying where is the money coming from and is it coming this year? That was my question.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I didn't say that was coming this year.

Mr. Dukszta: Okay. I will ask you the question—I understood from your answer that the McMaster programme may start this year—am I correct in understanding this?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I said that McMaster at the present time was talking with the people in Thunder Bay about developing this programme. I didn't say anything about when it was coming. I have to have more information on it. We certainly have to have more planning than we have at the present time. By the same token, Western University has been carrying on discussions with Windsor, but I can't tell you that is going to start this fall. It would be very stupid for me to make a statement such as that.

Mr. Dukszta: I agree you have to plan this but what is involved in the planning at both universities, especially McMaster has advanced to the point where they could do it if they had enough money to open a plant there. It is not a question of planning any longer. That is what I was asking, whether you prefer to give some money toward this?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Not this year.

Mr. Dukszta: That is the answer I was waiting for.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2301, is item 1 carried? Is item 2 carried? Item 3? Carried.

Mr. Stokes: Was that 1301?

Mr. Chairman: Pardon?

Mr. Stokes: Did you say 1301?

Mr. Chairman: No, 2301. The same one you were speaking on. Now we are down to item 5. Does anyone wish to discuss item 6? Item 7? Item 8? Is vote 2301 carried?

Vote 2301 agreed to.

On vote 2302:

Mr. Chairman: Health promotion and disease prevention programme.

Mr. Stokes: On 2302, Mr. Chairman, I am treading on an area here I don't know a great deal about but it is something that has been of concern to me for a good long while. Since we do lack the ability in remote areas of the province to provide, on an ongoing and on an assured basis, the kind of medical and dental delivery system that we think we should have, I have been doing some research into ways of taking preventative action.

One of the things that intrigued me was a study that has been going on for quite some time on nutrition. The minister is obviously

much more aware of what has been going on in the field than I am. People have been doing some studies on why people become alcoholics or schizophrenic. There is a doctor out in Saskatchewan who did an awful lot of work on this. There is a clinic in New York State which has done a lot of good work in this field.

I am talking about bio-vitamins. People, as I say, have a drinking problem because they aren't getting a balanced diet. One writer that I have researched says:

Through understanding of good nutrition, Napoleon won many a battle and Britain ruled the waves, for it was Napoleon who said, an army marches on its stomach and it was the British sailor who resisted scurvy in the days of sailing ships, because they were given the juice of a lime daily.

It seems to me that I don't know that this government is doing anything by way of prevention, by going out into communities and making people aware of the need for good dietary habits. By giving their children, and even adults, a good balanced diet, a good many of their medical problems would be solved before they even got started.

As I say, I am not an expert. I am a rank amateur when it comes to nutrition and the whole health field. I am wondering, how much of this $79 million is going into this kind of research? I am concerned about it because, in many northern areas where they aren't exposed to fresh fruit, fresh vegetables —it's almost impossible to come by, for obvious reasons, because of the remoteness, because of the cost of getting fresh produce into these areas.

If there is any validity in these studies that have been going on, it is obvious that these people have to have dietary supplements. They have got to have vitamins which will take care of malnutrition and the imbalance in their diet.

I am thinking in terms of native people who, for many, many months during the year, have their diet restricted to fish or to wild meat, very little by way of good whole milk, very little by way of fresh fruit and fresh vegetables. There seems to be sufficient evidence around to indicate that a good many of the problems with which people in the north are confronted can be tracked back to an improper diet and an improper balance in the things that people need to remain healthy.

I am wondering if the minister would care to comment on this?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In these estimates $108,000 goes to nutrition experts, consultants in the nutrition field who are available in the health unit nurses in an advisory capacity to assist them with this programme.

All of us can talk a great deal about the terrific cost of health delivery services. As a physician I can get up and suggest we are spending too much time in treating patients and that we should spend much more time on a prevention programme. But when you say to an individual, "This is fine", how do we prevent somebody from getting sick? It's not quite as easy as it sounds.

I appreciate that in many cases our diets in some areas of the province lend to illness, but at the same time I think far too many people in the province take vitamins, not as a substitute, but in addition to a full diet which they don't need.

I think in many cases we use too many vitamins—not in the particular area the member is talking about, but down in this area of the province people get vitamin-conscious. They go into some of the stores today and see bottles of vitamins and think, "Oh boy, this is wonderful. I will take them to keep colds away,"—and this and that.

I think this is a lot of nonsense because, in most cases, our diet is such that we don't need these added vitamins. But, by the same token, it's a terrific education programme that we must launch to educate the people and try to—

Mr. Stokes: Why not in the classroom; why not right in the classroom?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Just a minute; if you will give me a minute. This is exactly what our communications branch is setting up to do at the present time. We have the assistance now of most of the organizations that we are working with: the Cancer Society, the Red Cross, the ARF, the medical people, the dental people, the hospitals, and as many people as we have been able to get involved with.

Now, hopefully, we will be started next month and we are going to use the news media on a regular basis to acquaint the people of this province of what our health programme is and how it should be used; where the facilities are; what the facilities are; what happens when they use them.

To go a step further, we want to educate them and teach them what proper health procedures are. One of the big areas in the

dental field in which we can help is to teach people how to properly care for their teeth; how to properly clean their teeth. By the same token, we can teach them what a proper diet is.

But that is only part of our programme. As you know, a large proportion of the people of the province, no matter what you tell them about alcohol and what it is going to do to them, and no matter how often we tell them what cigarette smoking is going to do to them; they are going to do it anyway. All we can do is just keep pounding away and draw their attention what happens to people when they do imbibe too much, or when they do pay little attention to their diet. They can still get scurvy and they can get beri beri. These conditions are prevalent today—I shouldn't say prevalent—but they do occur today. We used to think that these were conditions of a hundred years ago, but we get them now once in a while, too. So, I agree with you.

We have a big programme here. We have a big responsibility here to establish a programme, an education programme, that again, as you said, should be in the schools too. We will see that it gets there; but we have to develop this so that it gets to everybody across the province.

Mr. Stokes: You are spending $108,000 specifically on this programme in an estimate that involves the expenditure of $2,028,000-000. Now, it seems to me that if there is any validity to what you and I have been saying in the last 10 minutes, let's do something much more meaningful and let's say: "Well, let's put $10 million into it for a start."

If there is any validity in what we are saying, let's put enough money into it so that it is going to be meaningful. If you are talking about $108,000 to convince people all over the province that this is a worthwhile approach to take toward health care, and if you are going to put the emphasis on prevention, I am sure that we can muster well in excess of $108,000 in order to do something that is worthwhile; as we have agreed is the case.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think, as you have said, what we are going to have to consider now, in addition to consultants, are health educators to draw up a programme to educate the people of the province in what to do.

This is a good time to get back to this question. At the present time, we are spending $24 million on local health services. The Leader of the Opposition brought this up today, and I met with some of the local medical officers of health. The reason being that we now realize that the function of the local health units is entirely different today than it was 25 or 50 years ago.

We are taking a second look at the money we are spending in the health field. We are considering establishing the district health councils that we have been talking about and letting them eventually take over this responsibility and incorporate the public health system in with the delivery of health services in the community; which obviously takes in all types of facilities and all types of services. This is exactly what we are doing now. We have to incorporate and we have to establish health educators to work along this line.

Mr. Chairman: Will item 1—

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to go along with the member for Thunder Bay regarding the nutritional quality of foods here in Ontario. Often we can go into a supermarket and buy foods and particularly, orange juice. We have 100 per cent orange juice and we have concentrate that you mix with water. They always tell you that vitamin C—that's all you see on there—vitamin C is added; but it doesn't tell you in what quantity.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Are you sure?

Mr. Haggerty: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think it does; doesn't it?

Mr. Haggerty: You look! You take a good close look at it and see. It doesn't tell you. On many of the food products that we buy today we find the same thing. It doesn't actually tell us what quantity there is of vitamin C, vitamin B and so forth. You were saying that sometimes you might say we are on a pill thrill here in Ontario; every time we turn around we have to have a pill with every mouthful of food that we have taken.

Perhaps, if we had a proper system of listing how much vitamin C is included in the product this might help the consumer. When you look at it, everybody today seems to be on a crash diet in the Province of Ontario, and you see so much of this. How many persons know how many calories are in the food when they buy it in the packaged forms, let's say, like TV dinners and so forth? Why cannot the public be informed of how much vitamin C and other vitamins is in the particular packages?

Hon. Mr. Potter: According to the Federal Food and Drug Act, it is a requirement that this be on there. I'm sure if you look carefully, you will find it in small print. It does list—it's there. As I say, this comes under federal jurisdiction and it is required by federal law and it's there. Now in many of the diet foods –

Mr. Haggerty: You might find it on Kelloggs or one of the cereal products, but—

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is there. It has to be there. If you know of any instances where it isn't, let us have it. I'd be delighted to bring it to Mr. Monroe's attention. As far as dietary requirements are concerned, these diet foods list the number of calories per serving and so on, if you look carefully. This is a requirement of the Act.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: Under the programme of administration are grants for community health facilities in the sum of one-quarter of a million dollars. The minister has spoken of a fairly extensive support to the various community health facilities. I'm not now quite clear what the item refers to. Does it refer to an outright capital grant to one of those community health clinics or what does it refer to?

Hon. Mr. Potter: This is capital grants for establishment of community health units which is two thirds of the cost.

Mr. Chairman: Maybe before we start discussing the local health service we can carry item 1 and move on to item 2?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: If it is the wish of the members to discuss the whole vote and dispense with it. If so, it is all right with me, if the minister is prepared to deal with it in this manner.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is actually under item 1 in this particular case. The purpose of the grants in previous years was to provide assistance for the construction of facilities for local health agencies.

Mr. Dukszta: Can you tell me where they are?

Mr. Chairman: Okay, you are in order. We are taking the whole vote. Go ahead. Ask the minister the question. You had the floor to ask the minister the question on health services.

Hon. Mr. Potter: He has done it.

Mr. Dukszta: I just want to know where are—

Mr. Stokes: Where are the facilities you are spending the money on?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Scarborough. There was just one grant last year.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the minister could indicate, under the environmental health section of this vote, what is involved in that $2.6 million? What is the breakdown there?

Hon. Mr. Potter: What did you want broken down in this?

Mr. Laughren: I just want to know what is involved.

Mr. Stokes: What are you spending the money on?

Mr. Laughren: That $2.6 million, where is it going? What services are offered? What research?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Under environmental health we have salary and wages of $2,057,-100; employees' benefits of $175,900—

Mr. Haggerty: It tells us that: Give it in more detail. What research are they doing?

Mr. Stokes: Are they studying the environment to clean up the environment? Are they concerned about the environment?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No. That is the environmental ministry. That's not this. What we are talking about here takes into consideration—

Mr. Haggerty: Supplies and equipment.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —radiation protection, occupational health hazards, health studies, veterinary public health programme and that sort of thing.

Mr. Stokes: If there was an environmental problem affecting the health of people in a given area, would there be any money in this vote directed toward seeing what could be done to end it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They would be investigated. They do the investigating in this area.

Mr. Laughren: So, in other words, if there is a problem in a town in terms of a plant polluting the area, then you would provide the services to investigate? Is that what you are saying?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Just the medical aspects of it. What you are talking about, the Department of Environment would investigate the pollution. We investigate it from health standards.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you. There is a problem that I would like to mention. It's got nothing to do with Nickel Belt to show you that I'm not provincial or parochial about this. In the town of Caledonia, in the riding which is represented by the former Treasurer of the province (Mr. Allan), there is a gypsum plant now owned by Domtar. I suspect—and I can only suspect because obviously medical records are not available to me—that there are very serious bronchial problems among the workers who work in that plant and, in particular, among the workers who work in the mill in that plant.

I have appealed one case to the Workmen's Compensation Board on this and received a very unsatisfactory reply in that, just point blank it was not as a result of the man's working conditions that he is in the shape he is in. I wonder if you could make a commitment to take a rather detailed look at the problems in that plant and, in particular, in the mill area of that plant, because there are a fairly large number of the men who have fairly serious bronchial problems.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would make such a commitment because that does fall within our jurisdiction. I would be delighted to check that out.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: I am going to be somewhat parochial. I have been dealing, or a group of us from Parkdale has been dealing, with the Department of Environment, but the problem which I would like to discuss with and ask the minister about is, in fact, a problem of pollution of the environment, but, I think as a physician, concerns more and more the Department of Health. This is the problem of noise. Strictly speaking, it is under the control of the Ministry of Environment, yet so little has been known until recently about the effect of noise on the people. Few studies have been done, but the studies which have been done point out more and more that noise is one of the major hazards of our modern life.

Just to show you how prolonged it takes, and what elaborate means one has to go through to achieve a change, I was involved in a petition a year or so ago from Jameson Avenue residents to the city hall to ban traffic from Jameson Avenue. That was successful; the traffic was banned. The noise level was extremely high. When the trucks started through at 6 o'clock, you could literally feel the vibration in the buildings that people were living in. The noise level there is still, I think, at the level of 60 decibels. I am not sure that we can do that much about it at the moment. The particular instance that I would like to talk about now is around Campbell Avenue area in the middle part of Parkdale riding.

Hon. Mr. Potter: If I may interrupt, this comes under the Department of Environment. Occupational noise comes under the Health Ministry, but not a community noise, the kind of noise that you are talking about.

Mr. Dukszta: I was probably too long in my preamble, so I'll cut the preamble and I'll get straight to the point, thank you. I say that noise pollution, in fact, should be a concern of the Ministry of Health. The rules and regulations of the Department of the Environment at the moment are such that certain levels of noise in a particular area are acceptable and certain levels are not acceptable. Now a perennial noise has a definite, deleterious effect on the health of the individual, even if it is acceptable on a temporary basis. A noise level of 60 decibels over a period of three to four or five weeks or months, has an effect on your whole cardiovascular system. It also interferes with your sleep, and once it interferes with your sleep I assume it has a certain psychological effect on your work record, your interpersonal relations and other things.

I was wondering—just to bring up the question—how much of this money will in fact be spent on studying the effect of noise or other pollutants in the city of Toronto? I think it is your concern, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Once again, as far as the community noise is concerned, there's no money in here to spend on that. As far as industrial noise is concerned, yes, we're involved in establishing the standards and checking out the noise levels in industry

itself. But not as far as the community area is concerned. That comes under the Department of the Environment, so there isn't any money here for that.

Mr. Dukszta: Yes, okay. It's a new field and I am prepared to give the credit, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that you say that it hasn't been worked out. But surely you need some kind of a liaison between yourself and the Department of the Environment when it comes to such a definite effect?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That wasn't what you asked. You asked how much money was here for that. As I say, there isn't any, because we're not doing this.

Mr. Dukszta: Yes, okay; but can I suggest that it should be part of your concern within the context of this programme, and you haven't allocated any money at the moment, while it's a growing health hazard? I think it's a bigger health hazard than many others which we've been concerned with, because it's unknown.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, I agree this is just one of many of our problems that we should be more—

Mr. Dukszta: Yes, but are you prepared to do something soon, later or when?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We are doing it now, as far as industrial noise is concerned, but as far as environmental noise is concerned, we're not. That's within the Department of the Environment.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you. I believe that the problem of workers on the job suffering from things like heat comes under this vote, right? For example, I mentioned in the Legislature yesterday the problem of workers in the International Nickel Co. refinery at Copper Cliff, working under conditions of excessive heat, and I don't believe there's anything in the Mining Act to restrict the temperature in an area in which men are employed. I think that there are recommendations from an organization in the United States, which state that men should not have to work in an area in which the temperature exceeds their body temperature. I think it would probably require a change in the Mining Act, and I wonder if your department would make recommendations along those lines to the proper ministry?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, we would be glad to look into this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2302. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I want to get into something and I don't know whether it's even been discussed in this area before. It's a decided environmental problem that is almost unique to northern Ontario. I raise it because it involves disease, it involves infection, it involves discomfort, it drives people almost up the wall. And what I'm thinking of is pestilent insects.

I don't know whether there have been any tests made to decide what effect mosquitoes, blackflies, sand flies and all of the other little bugs that we have to contend with, certainly in the north, have on our health.

It seems to me a good many people down here, when they are considering a trip up north, will say, "Well, I'd love to visit that place. I'd love to go fishing there. I'd love to go hunting. I'd love to spend a week outdoors camping—but how are the flies in that area? How are they at that particular time of the year?"

Have there been any studies done at all to determine the effect that these things have on people, not only from a point of view of their being a pest? I am wondering to what extent are they conveyers of disease. I know that if it wasn't for DDT, I suppose, many areas would be overrun with malaria and things of that nature, because mosquitoes do carry disease from one person to another.

Have there been any studies at all? Or would you mind putting aside, say, $10,000 or $20,000 out of this $2 billion to have somebody go up and make a preliminary survey to see whether anything can be done to eliminate the huge quantities of mosquitoes and blackflies that we have? Certainly in the north and in any place that's associated with dense underbrush and swamps, we do have these pests and I am just wondering is there anything you can do to indicate that we may be coming to grips with the problem?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The entomological departments, federally, as you know, are experimenting all the time with the control of this sort of thing across Canada. There is no evidence to show that insects of this nature in Canada spread disease or carry disease of any kind. Certainly in the tropical countries that does happen, but it doesn't happen here.

As far as I can determine, there have been no studies done which compare working efficiency under conditions such as this to that in areas where there aren't any insects or flies. There are no records of any of this having been done.

It is an interesting area and we'll take a look at it. I don't know just how we would approach it.

Mr. Stokes: I have often wondered if anything could be done. It seems to me that it is something we should be studying because, believe me, coming from an area of the province that has more than its share of insect pests, I often wondered why something wasn't done. The minister was up in Big Trout Lake I think last year and I think if he got out and did any fishing at all—and he was very foolish if he didn't—if he didn't notice the blackflies and the mosquitoes, it's just beyond me.

One of the things in this vote that I want to get involved in, by way of information, is the item of detoxification centres, $750,000. I know only of one in all of northern Ontario and it's sort of a drying out tank rather than a detoxification centre. Could you give me a breakdown of the $750,000 expenditure?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, we have the west central centre in Toronto, with 18 beds; Seaton House, with 20 beds; ARF institute, with 20 beds; Hamilton unit, now being planned, with 20 beds; London unit, now being planned, with 20 beds; and there will be one in the Kenora unit of 35 beds. The estimate on this is $750,000.

I have been advised by ARF since this that they feel they are going to be able to institute these at considerably less than this. This will make more money available to us to start to try to get into operation some of the other programmes which we were planning for next year.

In addition to these—and it is not included in this estimate—we are requesting that the hospitals across the province in areas where these centres won't be located will make a facility available at the hospital. So that just because somebody comes from Timbuctu and there isn't a detoxification centre, there is no reason why he will be thrown in the cooler overnight. They'll take him to the hospital to dry him out. We are in the process of getting this started.

Mr. Stokes: Is that the case at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Potter: This is what we are trying to get started at the present time.

Mr. Stokes: It isn't in effect now then?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, it isn't. We are just moving now.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Tell me a little bit about this planned 20-bed unit in Hamilton. Where do you propose to put this?

An hon. member: It's already in.

Hon. Mr. Potter: In Hamilton?

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There are three hospitals working together in conjunction with the local health co-ordinating council, planning the establishment of a detoxification centre. Backup medical services are being discussed with the Hamilton General and St. Joseph's Hospital and would depend primarily on the centre's financial geographical location. It is anticipated this centre will be planned and operational by Sept. 1.

Exactly which of these locations they are going to locate it in, I can't tell you, but we are discussing it with them at the present time to determine which is going to be the best location.

Mr. Deans: Oh!

Hon. Mr. Potter: They hope to have it open by Sept. 1.

Mr. Deans: I gather the intention is to locate the centre in one of the existing general hospitals.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Close to, if not in.

Mr. Deans: Close to or in, right. And obviously they will be making an announcement about this in the near future.

Hon. Mr. Potter: As soon as we make the decision.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2302; the hon. membership for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: Under the programme description, Mr. Chairman, it states that the programme also includes assistance to local health agencies and homes for special care. Regarding the number of people in the Ontario hospital system who often have been kept waiting for beds in the homes for special care, have you had any figures recently on the movement and the opening up of it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, again, Mr. Chairman, it is limited only by funds. As you are aware, we have so much money available and as the money becomes available, we open up more. I think there are 5,500 who are in homes for special care at the present time, and I am aware that there are also a number who can be placed in homes for special care as soon as we have facilities or funds available to do it. We are working toward it all the time.

Mr. Dukszta: Is it the facilities or the money that is lacking at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Money.

Mr. Dukszta: Yes, well, that is a very good point. I think you've given this answer to me at least four times, that there is no money. And surely it has to be taken into account that you have money for other things which it may not have been necessary to spend it on.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's a question of priorities, Mr. Chairman. We are trying to work out our priorities, and no matter how we work them out, we are not going to satisfy everybody anyway. But we are doing the best we can. As the money becomes available, we will develop more of these programmes.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, I don't necessarily mean that everyone has to be satisfied, There are certain scientific criteria which are applicable to where money should go in the health field, and the minister at the moment is merely answering me in generalities.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2302.

The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Let me ask you this again—I am just trying to clear up in my mind the matter of the detoxification centres. What study has been done in the Hamilton area in regard to the number of persons who are basically drunks that end up in the Ontario Hospital? You know, I get the impression from my discussions with the—well, let me try this again from another angle.

You mention that there are three general hospitals involved in the setting up of this centre. It seems to me that a great many of the people who suffer from alcoholism end up in the Ontario Hospital, the psychiatric hospital, and I am a little concerned because I suspect that what we are really talking about in terms of the 20-bed unit is a very short-term proposition.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I know what you are getting at. No, this just relates to the detoxification centre. We have to have a—call it what you like; I don't like to use the phrase, "halfway house," because we are using that for so many other areas. But once they are dried out, then we have to have another type of facility in which we can take these individuals to try to help them beat the habit, if you'd like to call it that. Otherwise, all we are doing is drying them out today, turning them loose tomorrow and they are back in tomorrow night. That is just no good.

Mr. Deans: Yes, this is what happened in the past.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Since we now are setting up the detoxification centres, we at the social development committee, along with Community and Social Services, are working out the details of the next phase of providing an additional type of facility that will help to cure these individuals.

Mr. Deans: Is the department—

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think this is what you are referring to.

Mr. Deans: That's right; that's exactly what I am referring to.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is no sense in doing one without the other.

Mr. Deans: Oh yes, I agree.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Deans: We have had the drying-out process for years.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Deans: It was occasionally done in police cells, on other occasions in psychiatric hospitals, and on occasion in general hospitals—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Deans: —and then they ended up back on the street and they were regular visitors.

Hon. Mr. Potter: And they'd start all over again.

Mr. Deans: In Hamilton, on part of the Mountain Expressway—I forget what it's called at the moment, strange though it may seem; Kenilworth Access, I suppose—there is a thing called the "Halfway House." The building belongs to the municipality. It is a rather small building, but it seems to operate

fairly effectively. I am interested in knowing whether the province, and the Department of Health in particular, is involved at this point in that operation, either by way of financial assistance or by way of assistance in terms of care for the people; that kind of thing?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, grants for those come under the Ministry of Community and Social Services. We're not involved in this department in that. You mentioned before about admissions to mental hospitals. I'm told, and I can't verify this accurately, but I am told that at Lakeshore, particularly, it could be as high as 40 per cent of hospital admissions to the mental hospital are alcohol related.

Mr. Deans: Yes, that is what worries me. I suspect that it is very high; particularly of those who are voluntary overnight guests.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Some are involuntary.

Mr. Deans: Some are involuntary. They arrive there under escort. But nevertheless, I sense that the psychiatric hospitals are being used for that purpose to a great extent in Hamilton; but I don't know if it is true all over the province. It always worries me because it is not the proper environment—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Pretty expensive treatment.

Mr. Deans: It's very expensive. I wonder really, what the effect of the detoxification centre—considering it is rather small, and will take care of so few people—what we would expect as an overall effect on our community in regard to alcoholism?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We would like to have it any at all.

Mr. Deans: I wonder if the minister is able to give us some kind of programme that the Ministry of Health intends to follow over the next number of years in establishing, not only the centre for the drying-out process, but the kind of support services that will be necessary in the community in order to cope with those many people who suffer from what is really a very, very serious and destroying disease. If it is a disease, or illness; I don't know? I just wonder what we have planned by way of more concrete—

Hon. Mr. Potter: At the present time Mr. Chairman, we are accepting the advice and recommendations of the addiction research people in this programme. It is they who have recommended the detoxification centres and recommended that we establish the follow-up type of procedures. It will be working very closely with them.

I can't give you the exact details or plans of what we can look for in the future except that these are the two stages now that we are in the process of setting up. You are undoubtedly aware of the farm that the addiction research has in Elora. This is, to me, really just another part of the whole programme.

Mr. Deans: The ideal thing, of course, in built-up areas like Metropolitan Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, or wherever you want to name, is to have some kind of facility where these people can maintain their day-to-day relationships with work and their friends; but a place where they can go in the evenings; a place where they can go from early evening on and where they will be coming back and forth and will be under some kind of supervision and have help available to them.

I know of a number of people who have had very serious alcoholic problems; and they try very hard. They begin to understand how serious the problem is and they do begin to try very hard; but there just isn't—other than people like Alcoholics Anonymous—there just isn't the facility for them, and they are not always able to sustain themselves over those periods of need.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You are undoubtedly aware of the programme that ARF has now where it works very closely with industry to assist the employee with this type of problem.

Mr. Chairman: Vote—

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, with "halfway houses" and homes for the alcoholics, was I correct in understanding what the minister said that these are not your responsibility, but they become the Ministry of Community and Social services?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, it is correlated.

Mr. Dukszta: It is correlated. You mean, in fact, not entirely under your department. Could I ask the minister a question then? How soon does he think this second stage of the proposed plan by the Addiction and Research Foundation will be implemented following the creation, on a fairly extensive scale, of the detoxification centre?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Of necessity, it's going to have to be open along about the same time or else the detoxification centres aren't going to be providing the service they should provide. We are working towards that goal.

Mr. Dukszta: But it is not open at the moment and—

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is right but we are just in the process of setting these things up now and we are working on them.

Mr. Dukszta: What would be the amount of money that you expect it would cost to establish one of them? Do you have an idea of how much?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't got that.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2302 carried?

Vote 2302 agreed to.

On vote 2303:

Mr. Chairman: Treatment and rehabilitation programme.

Mr. Stokes: Does this programme take in the mental retardation services?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is 2304.

Mr. Stokes: I see.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, are we on 2303 right now?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we are on 2303.

Mr. Dukszta: On treatment and rehabilitation? Does this involve the whole hospital system and Ontario hospitalization? That's one of the biggest items we have. Am I correct? Does this involve the government subsidy to the hospitals?

Mr. Chairman: It involves hospital management.

Mr. Dukszta: All hospital management? Okay. This is the item that I would like—

Hon. Mr. Potter: The whole hospital system.

Mr. Dukszta: But it does not include the psychiatrical hospital system?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No.

Mr. Dukszta: Okay. I would like to point out to the minister since he was, I thought, so cavalier in discounting some of my concerns about environmental health as not being in the Department of Health but the Department of the Environment, that he has allowed a very small amount for what is in fact the most important part of a health scheme—which is a preventive one—and a very large amount for the acute treatment centres at the hospitals.

I am not going to quarrel with the fact that we have to spend money to treat people when they are acutely ill. But this is surely the time to point out that that is where economy must be made and not on programmes for environmental control, detoxification centres, halfway houses or special homes.

This is one area in which the government has been incredibly guilty of not controlling the costs which have been rising at the rate of something like 15 per cent per year in this area of health; that is, the hospital costs. I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that the government has a very active role to play in bringing some order into what goes on in this vast area.

If you look at the area of Toronto, the inner city has a number of large teaching hospitals concentrated in one area, and nothing very much can be done about this except maybe moving one hospital to the suburbs—like St. Michael's moving to Scarborough. Little has been done at the moment in terms of dividing the responsibilities of various large teaching hospitals in respect of Metropolitan Toronto.

All the large hospitals claim, I think, that they receive patients not only from Toronto but that their responsibility is also to the whole province, when they get more interesting or more perplexing medical cases. The point I would like to make here is that this enormous expenditure of money—which is rising rapidly and will be rising more and more rapidly—is partially due not so much to the technological innovations or the necessary treatment provided but to the very fact that we are duplicating medical services.

I know that you have been concerned with this, Mr. Minister. I wondered whether it is not possible, when we look at this question, to be concerned more and to be even more actively involved in setting up priorities. The point I was making in my preliminary remarks to the estimates was that in Toronto there are three large teaching hospitals which compete more and more actively in terms of cardiac surgery. These are Western Hospital, St. Michael's and Toronto General. For a city the size of Metro Toronto, which has 2 million people, there are two hospitals at the moment which in fact do heart trans-

plants. Admittedly, the two large hospitals serve the rest of the province in terms of heart transplants. I am not going to say a word against heart transplants, since it has become almost like a motherhood issue at the moment, though I personally believe it is unnecessary to have two large hospitals being concerned. It is a fantastic expenditure of money and it serves no real purpose to have two institutions when we should really have one which correlates all the division of labour necessary, because it is one of the more expensive research projects that exists and the benefit at the moment, to say the least, it is probably slight.

We may be, in fact, on a totally wrong avenue at the moment in terms of heart transplants, and of throwing so much money into this particular research. We perhaps should do much more in terms of providing plastic hearts, or whatever is most useful. We are not sure. But the point is that there is no overall control over the teaching hospitals in Metropolitan Toronto. Each hospital is a state unto itself and tends to compete with other teaching hospitals in terms of status, enrolments, prestige, and a number of other things.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The honeymoon's over.

Mr. Dukszta: Then I am very relieved. When exactly are you going to bring that edict in and bring them into order. Is this on the record that you are actually going to plan actively at the moment to settle the priorities as to which hospital does what? Are you prepared, also, to go as far as saying which hospital should have renal dialysis, which hospital should do the cardiac surgery and which hospital should do various other specialized functions?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Not only in Toronto, Mr. Chairman, but in other communities and in the whole of Ontario. It is necessary now with the cost of health services in this province that we do be very careful about our priorities, and make sure that there is not unnecessary duplication of services. Certainly with modern methods of transportation, it is not necessary to provide all the services everywhere. In certain specific instances that you have listed, there is no need to have more than one or two, as you have said, cardiovascular units to serve the province. Really we don't need to have this all over the province and, economically, it just isn't feasible. We are prepared to see that a very careful study is done on all these programmes and establish our priorities.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Minister, how? I know how it works in a general hospital, when a group of physicians who, after all, dominate and exert more control over a hospital than anyone else, decide that they need a cardiac surgery unit. It is very easy for them to persuade both the board of governors and other people and say they need it, and it is done. Either, first, you hire the cardiac surgeon and then you get the unit or vice versa. But how do you propose, in fact, at the moment to intervene to such an extent?

It needs essentially a fairly strong body which will say bluntly to the hospital you can't have it. That is one way for future development, if someone is asking for a new cardiac surgery unit. But how are you going to rationalize the present system which is what I would like to know and which is already extremely wasteful and duplicates a number of services? Could you give me a more specific answer rather than the fairly general, hopeful, somewhat of a motherhood answer that you have given me so far?

Hon. Mr. Potter: In the future, all new programmes will be on a priority basis. We control it with money.

Mr. Dukszta: I am a great believer in that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: If we turn it down, they don't get the money. I think that pretty well explains it.

Mr. Dukszta: Yes, okay, that explains it for the future and I accept it. It is very good.

There are now two cardiac transplant units in the city of Toronto. Do you believe that they are both necessary?

Hon. Mr. Potter: By the same method they are using in other areas, which I've met in other municipalities where we have had duplications of services in hospitals, they are now getting together through our hospital planning council, hopefully through our district health councils, that will be developed in the future. They are working out between themselves and with our assistance the programmes that you are just talking about. Where one hospital is saying: "Okay, we will take all the obstetrics and gynaecology over here, you take all the cardiovascular surgery over there; we will provide the lab facilities, you provide the out-patient services; we will provide the x-ray facilities—" and so on. This can be worked out, and it is being worked out, and we will continue to see that it works out.

Mr. Dukszta: The minister is telling me that it is going to be done on a voluntary basis in co-operation with the various hospitals? What is going to be your role in the setting up of priorities? Now I am not talking of the future, where in fact you have the purse strings and just by pulling a lever—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Our role is encouraging them to do it. We're going to them and saying: "Look, we have to find a more economical way of providing these services and we must do it on a co-operative basis." And so far it is succeeding.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): I would just like to clarify, Mr. Minister, is this where the psychiatric hospitals and the special care vote comes under?

Mr. Chairman: That is the next one.

Mr. Worton: That's fine.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Can I just pursue the point that my colleague was making in rationalizing the services of these hospitals? As the minister knows, I think he was up in my riding of the city of Sudbury a short time ago, and he knows that there has been a division in hospital services there. It breaks down on ethnic lines and religious lines, wherein you have a Protestant memorial hospital, you have an Irish-Catholic general hospital, and you have a French-Catholic hospital. And the boards of governors of each of these particular hospitals, as you know very well, have not been co-operating. As long as you have these individual, self-appointed, self-annointed boards, who live by perpetuating their own rule in that they are self-appointing and self-governing, I just don't see how you are going to bring these people into line unless you choose a hard line and, through some manner, you abolish these boards or in some other way make them responsible and liable to the will of the public. You know and I know we have been struggling with this problem in my city for these many years now, and it has been detrimental to the provision of health services in that city. To make my mind clear, what does the minister plan to do with that particular problem which we have in my particular city?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I plan to do just what you suggested. As you have said, I don't think there is a worse mess in Ontario than you have in Sudbury today with the hospital situation. Unless the hospital boards in Sudbury are prepared to work with the hospital planning council and set it up, then we will go up and do it for them. But it is going to be done. We are not going to go on wasting money the way it has been wasted there, as you have already said here today, by one hospital board competing with another, absolutely refusing to get together to develop anything. If they are not prepared to do it —they are always complaining about Queen's Park interfering in doing things for them, but any municipality that can't do it on their own is opening the door to us and saying, "You come on in and do it for us," and that is exactly what we are going to have to do up there if they are not prepared to do it.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Minister, you have my full support. Any time you want to come in there and lower the boom on that group, which has been frustrating us these many years, you have my full support.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Thank you.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, the minister is absolutely fabulous when he is in a rage and indignant about organized medicine, and I am really in full support of that. But I would like to point out that it is not enough to speak of one particular area, because the whole question of who governs the hospitals and who is responsible for care in hospitals has not been reviewed properly. It is no use relying on a constant voluntary effort, occasional incantations, and occasional losing of the temper, however effective it is, to influence the present system, when in fact the system itself is such that it is really non-influenceable. When you look at who governs the hospital officially, it is supposed to be the board, which tends to be self-appointed, self-perpetuating, never representing the community, very seldom representing anything except itself and maybe some of the medical interests. We can look at the question of hospitals in Toronto, or all hospitals in Ontario, in two large parameters; one is that the board is non-representative, ineffectual, self-perpetuating and tends to have more of a class interest of its own class, which is the business class, at heart than it has of the patients of the community at large.

The second one is that the physicians themselves are at the moment not prepared

to change—will not change—that easily, because they have never had the habit, nor is there the necessary legislative framework which will force the physicians, in fact, to introduce the changes.

I am returning constantly to the same point that it needs, in fact, a much more active central involvement, which is the government involvement, in this area: 1. In changing the legislation, which would allow for more representative community boards in the hospitals; and 2, involvement in terms of priorities.

I was very pleased with what the minister said, that in the future, when it comes to priorities, he will exert all his financial power to bring some order into the ordering of resources and priorities in the hospital scene in Toronto. But it is not enough at the moment. I think that we have to realize that the physicians have not been able to govern themselves.

If you look at the second part of the equation that I have been designing, there is what I think is a fascinating book called "Organized Medicine in Ontario," which is a study prepared by Professor J. W. Grove, of the department of political studies in Queen's University, Kingston. When you look through his book, the evidence that he has presented and the facts he has accumulated show over and over again that the physicians themselves are almost totally incapable of any regulation; they have not done this and it is a pious and fairly useless hope that the physicians in the hospitals, combined with the ineffectual, non-representative boards, will actually come and decide to do something themselves.

The time for voluntaryism is past, as is the time for voluntary charity. We are not now living in the age when the lady bountifuls can correct the present distortion of the hospital system. I believe that it has to be the government which has to move in and do it and much more actively which means both legislatively and by your own intervention, Mr. Minister.

We cannot rely on or hope for an act of Heaven, or act of contrition, or a *mea culpa*, from the medical profession or the board to change it. Nothing has changed at all at the moment and I urge specifically both the department and the minister that this has to be taken strongly into consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 2303 carry?

Mr. Deans: I have a number of other matters—there are a number of things that I would like to ask, particularly about a vote as large as this.

Mr. Chairman: Would you like to make a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Deans: I could move the motion, but I suspect it would be better if the House leader—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Certainly.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn I would inform the House that on Tuesday we will continue with these estimates.

I think I would advise the House that on Thursday we will proceed with legislation as it appears on the order paper, items 12 through to 23. That is about all we can get at in that day; and then we will proceed beyond that with the estimates as outlined earlier.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 19, 1972

Report of Tri-Level Interim Planning Committee, statement by Mr. McKeough 2641

Report of Tri-Level Interim Planning Committee, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2641

Plea bargaining in Ontario courts, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2642

Order of business remaining in session, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2642

Medical officers of health, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2643

Increases in municipal property taxes, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Deans, Mr. R. F. Nixon 2643

WoodGreen survey report, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Cassidy 2645

Delay in exhumation, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman 2646

Food imports, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Haggerty 2646

Pollution on farms, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. MacDonald 2646

Windsor senior citizens' housing, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Lewis 2647

Senior regional development analyst, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Stokes 2648

Legal aid for US citizens, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Ruston 2648

Windsor Packers, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Bounsall 2649

Kenora-Rainy River transportation study, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Reid 2649

Sale of children's home property in Hamilton, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Deans 2649

Sale of homes to OHC tenants, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. B. Newman 2649

Pollution index readings at Falconbridge mine, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Shulman 2649

Presence of provincial secretaries during estimates, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Reid 2650

Breakout from girls' home, questions of Mr. Apps: Mr. Shulman 2651

Mobile housing, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. B. Newman 2651

Treasury bills, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Shulman 2651

Mobile housing, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. B. Newman 2652

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 2653

Estimates, Ministry of Health, Mr. Potter, continued 2653

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2677

No. 68

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again we are pleased to have many visitors with us today. I would particularly like to mention that in the Speaker's gallery we have the President of the Grand National Assembly of Romania, the Hon. Stefan Voitec, and a group of parliamentarians and other persons from Romania. In the east gallery we have students from Beverley Heights Jr. High School of Downsview, in the west gallery students from Churchill Heights Public School of Scarborough, and in both galleries the Associated Hebrew Schools of Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

TASK FORCE ON LITTER

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to announce that the Ministry of the Environment is launching an all-out drive this summer against litter. This campaign will be all-encompassing and will include advertising on radio, television, newspapers, billboards and posters. Our budget for this advertising, $150,000, may give the hon. members some idea of the importance we attach to the problem of litter.

Certainly I don't have to tell this House how badly human carelessness can degrade the environment. We have all seen the effect litter can have on Queen's Park, around these legislative buildings. I believe that the people of Ontario are convinced that action must be taken to discourage littering. We have been overwhelmed over the past year by requests for action on this problem and by personal and public statements of concern.

Basically what we want is to pull everyone together in one massive campaign government agencies, municipalities, citizen groups and industrial and commercial associations, to make every citizen of Ontario conscious of the consequences of his carelessness with trash. Over the weekend the hon. members may have heard singing commercials on the fight against litter. These are just the first of many to come from industry and from our people in this summer's campaign.

A task force on litter is holding its first meeting Thursday, May 25, and members have been invited from public groups, the Consumers Association of Canada, Pollution Probe, the Conservation Council, the City Engineers Association and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario. The task force will also include representatives from the ministries of Transportation and Communications, Natural Resources, Education and, of course, the Environment.

There will also be representatives from the Retail Council of Canada, the Retail Merchants Association, the Packaging Association the Glass Container Council, the Metal Container Manufacturers Advisory Council and the Canadian Soft Drink Association.

We will all be joining together to make this litter campaign work.

We've seen successful litter campaigns in the past; a good example is Operation Littercheck sponsored by the soft drink and container manufacturers, which has shown good results since it started last year. But this time we are all pulling together, hopefully to fire a very effective and real broadside.

The keynote of my ministry's campaign will be ads on television, on billboards along our highways and at our border crossings, and in other media. This will introduce the public to the most effective pollution control device to keep Ontario beautiful—the trashcan.

Before we're through, we expect to hear a real public outcry for more trash receptacles in our parks, on our streets and along our beaches, and we'll be asking municipalities and civic groups to provide these receptacles.

If it works—or perhaps I should say when it works—when we can make everyone stop and think before he or she discards so much as a gum wrapper, we will be well on our way to a much cleaner, more attractive province.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Who wrote that, Dalton Camp?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You can start by throwing away your press releases.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It's the result of a lot of great minds.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is it true that the programme is going to cost $200,000?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Which one?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The one he is announcing.

Hon. Mr. Auld: For us it's $150,000.

Mr. Singer: Through Dalton Camp?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, Case Associates.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

CONTROL OF PESTICIDES

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would also like to make a statement concerning the position of pesticides in relation to human health and environmental effects.

I would also like to table a report made by the committee appointed to study the classification, transportation, distribution, storage and sales of pesticides in Ontario.

During the last few years the use of pesticides and their effects on mankind and the environment has caused a great deal of concern. One example of this concern was the controversy over the use of DDT, and it became readily apparent that the control programmes set up by governments were not adequate.

Mr. J. E. Foulds (Port Arthur): A red Tory just walked in the House.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): That is a great entry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I hasten to reassure the House that the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) and myself did not organize this as part of this statement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It certainly is distracting from your statement.

Mr. Lewis: Well almost anything would have.

Mr. Foulds: That is what you call an entrance.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, it looks better than DDT.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. members will pay no attention to the distraction.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, back on pesticides.

Consequently, in 1970, the Ontario Department of Health appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Keith Laver to study and report on pesticides from the application and sales standpoints.

The committee was composed of specialists from associated trade industries, universities, chemical industries and various provincial and federal government agencies. They have submitted the report recommending that specific action be taken by the government of Ontario.

Control of pesticides now falls under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Environment and we are engaged in a thorough evaluation of this report.

In broad terms, the committee recommends that future control of pesticides be based on the principle of classification on the basis of toxicity to humans and the natural environment, and secondly to ensure the safe handling and sale of pesticides and recommends that premises selling these things be licensed.

The task group recommends that all basic pesticides be legally classified into four categories: (a) restricted; (b) commercial; (c) home and garden; and (d) unrestricted with the following criteria—vendors of pesticides become subject to regulations limiting the storage, transportation and sale of pesticides as outlined in the report. Also, that the Ministry of the Environment set into motion the additional research necessary to implement the above proposed legislation by requesting the Ontario Pesticides Advisory Committee to classify approximately 4,500 mixtures of pesticides on the Ontario market using the classification of basic compounds referred to in the first recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure hon. members will see that the report also details the guidelines for classification in all categories as well as recommendations for licensing pesticide manufacturers, formulators and vendors.

At the present time in Ontario, licensed applicators are not restricted to the pesticides which they may use or may purchase, except for pesticides used in plant and animal production, for example, farming. In addition, premises storing and/or selling pesticides are under no restrictions which is a

danger insofar as incorrect usages and the possibility of food contamination are concerned.

The prime concern is that this House accept the principle of using classification as the basis for legislation and that the government enact regulations in this regard. I invite all hon. members to review the report and I will look forward to comments and suggestions relating to this very important field.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

TASK FORCE ON LITTER

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Further to the minister's statement on litter, is he going to lead the gathering throng opposing litter by implementing the government's promise to ban non-returnable bottles? We would support him on this side if he would undertake that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I think I said during the estimates, I am not convinced that that is the major problem as far as litter is concerned. Secondly, having looked in a cursory sort of way at the efforts of two of our sister provinces, as I think I said in the estimates, I would prefer to make my own mistakes and not make the mistakes that somebody else has already made. It is a problem, it's about four per cent.

Frankly, from looking around, I think all hon. members might agree that because of the garbage strike in Toronto we had an opportunity to see what we have been throwing away in the last four months last winter when the snow melted. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition might agree that even if there were no cans and bottles of any kind — returnable or non-returnable around—there's still a great big mess and that is what we have to clean up.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: The minister is not going to act on various recommendations made in support of such a ban? As a matter of fact, he is now saying that government policy has changed and there will be no support of a ban on non-returnable bottles?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I don't think that is what I said at all, Mr. Speaker. I said that this is part of the problem and we are looking at it pretty carefully. I don't think that that is the final answer and I think that the whole litter problem is far bigger than bottles or cans.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: While the minister is making up his mind what government policy is as regards returnable bottles, will he consider enabling legislation that would permit municipalities to prohibit the use of non-returnable bottles?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I'll certainly consider it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

LANDFILL IN KEMPENFELT BAY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On another matter, of the same minister: Did the city of Barrie request permission to undertake landfill in the north side of Kempenfelt Bay which is being objected to locally by members of Pollution Probe?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, I'll find out. It hasn't come to my attention before.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would it not be necessary for permission to be granted by the department before such a fill in the bay would be undertaken? It would be necessary? Right.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions!

PETAWAWA BRIDGE DAMAGE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Can he tell the House what steps are being taken to correct the economic damage being done to the Petawawa-Pembroke areas, particularly to the merchants in those areas, as a result of the direction of detour traffic because of the failure of the Petawawa bridge? Secondly can he explain why his colleague, the member for Renfrew North, has indicated publicly that he feels that both this minister and the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development are indifferent to the needs of the people in that area?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, answering the latter part first, I'm not aware of any such public pronouncement—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In the Ottawa Journal.

Mr. Singer: It's right behind the minister.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Answering the first part of the question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in my opinion we did step in there fairly quickly and tried to remedy the situation having regard to the circumstances. Insofar as economic impact is concerned, relating to the merchants, my ministry has not undertaken any study with a view to reimbursing them for their losses.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the minister not agree they are not looking for reimbursement, but simply a better direction of the detour traffic, so that in fact those towns will not be cut off from the trade that is associated with traffic on Highway 17 normally passing through their town?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that one of the Bailey bridges will be in this week. I will check into that and see if there is a better detour. My understanding was that this had been looked into and the bridges were being put up as fast as possible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Check with the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hamilton) on that, too.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister intervene so that certain commercial traffic could use the existing Bailey bridge? It is an army camp property and commercial traffic is being excluded from using that bridge. In light of this, a hardship is being created for lumber companies trucking lumber into Pembroke for processing before shipping to southern Ontario. This could result in job lay-offs in southern Ontario if this lumber can't go through.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I'll check into this matter; but bear in mind that a Bailey bridge may or may not be adequate for serving the commercial traffic; I'll check into it.

Mr. Good: They are ready to limit their loads if they can only use it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

UNIVERSITY TUITION FEES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities: Is it government policy to prevent universities from absorbing a part of the tuition increase that was dictated by the Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough) budget a few weeks ago? A second question associated with the first: Has the minister communicated with any people in the university administration level indicating government policy in this regard?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Yes Mr. Speaker, my understanding is we do not have the power to prevent universities from charging a lower tuition fee than that set by my ministry in relation to the BIU formula. However, we have communicated with the universities and have suggested that they do charge the same fees as we indicated will be calculated in their formula.

The reason for this is, I think, obvious. We want to avoid any unhealthy competition between these universities. We think that it would be harmful, mainly to the smaller, to the newer universities; they wouldn't have, possibly, the same amount of funds available to reduce their tuition fees to any degree.

It was just a suggestion really; or you may go so far as to say it was a directive from the ministry. But it's not an order, because I don't believe we can actually prevent them. Technically, I think possibly they have the power to lower the fees.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the University of Toronto be the only one with sufficient, let's say non-government resources to reduce the premium change? And since when did the Conservative government think it was unhealthy for competition to be on the basis of price?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I wouldn't say that University of Toronto, Mr. Speaker, was the only university. I would like to sort of group some of the larger universities in the province—such as Western and Queens—with Toronto, as an example.

We believe in competition; certainly we believe in the free enterprise system. But when some of these people are a little bigger than others; maybe they need some sort of government suggestion and direction.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, there's a good thought. Tell that to the Ontario Development Corp.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

AUTO WORKERS LAY-OFF THREAT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: What action has he taken or could he take with the possibility of the lay-offs at the Ford plants in Ontario due to the problems we have been reading about with the approval of the new Ford model in the United States?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Well, Mr. Speaker, at present the only action the minister can take is to obtain and seek all the information possible, in case this should happen; and to be prepared.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And the minister is doing that?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I am

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: On that question, Mr. Speaker, but to a different minister; may I ask the Minister of the Environment: What are the emission control standards maintained by Ontario in the production of motor vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Auld: They are the same as the US; the same as the government of Canada.

Mr. Lewis: If they are the same, and meet the standards, then how is it that allegedly, because I suspect it is part of a block, a car produced in Ontario does not meet the standard required by the United States when it is exported?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question. I read the story in the paper this morning, and made some inquiries of my own staff, but I don't have any answers as yet. I assume—and it is only an assumption from the one press report which I read, and I assume all members read—that in the design some part of the technology which worked in the laboratory didn't work on the simulated, actual use-type test.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the minister sees it as a defect in the prototype rather than in the emission control standards?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I honestly don't know.

Mr. Lewis: Could the minister check that out, because one would have assumed that Ontario standards are equal. And might he give the House a report about it? Otherwise I would appreciate knowing why it is unacceptable to the United States, given the auto trade pact.

Hon. Mr. Auld: So am I.

Mr. Lewis: All right!

A question, Mr. Speaker—because it is such a pleasure to see him on his feet—of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Can I ask—

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Spring flower!

BELL CANADA RATES

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the minister if the Province of Ontario made an official intervention in the Bell Canada rate hearings?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This hearing took place commencing March 1 last, and at that time we were prepared to make representations as to the whole aspect of that rate hearing. At that time the chairman advised us that a costing investigation would be commencing, and I am waiting for the terms of reference for this costing investigation this week. There will be a costing investigation starting in June or July of this year which will be a complete telecommunications costing investigation. Therefore, insofar as that particular rate case was concerned, we did intervene to determine the rate of return insofar as Bell Canada was concerned on their debt capital and on their equity capital. We had two experts—one in conjunction with the Province of Quebec, an expert in this field, and the other one, a Mr. Beatty from Toronto—and we did intervene, Mr. Speaker, to that degree. I am looking forward to the costing investigation which, as I explained to this Legislature before, will deal with such sophisticated things as depreciation, deferred taxation, flow-through accounting and all the other sophistications of that particular industry.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Will that be made available to us?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary to the minister, did he ask in his intervention that no further rate increase be awarded until the provinces had a chance to assess the costing information and make a further submission based on that information?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, we have been asking for this costing investigation to take place for several years now. It's not just a case of this past rate application. We have been asking for this for some years and we are delighted that this is now going to go forward.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is getting it. But he did not oppose the direct request for an increase in rate which was granted at the end of last week?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, we did oppose it. If you will recall, and I think the hon. member is aware, I believe there was same $78 million that the Bell were asking for in their rate application, and by the intervention of this province—

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Carton: —and the Province of Quebec, together with our expert witnesses, the exact figure was, I believe—and I am just going by the press reports on the weekend; I have not had a chance to read the decision in full—approximately $45 million to $48 million rather than the $78 million that they had asked for.

Mr. Lewis: Could the minister table Ontario's intervention? Would it be possible for him to let us see the document which was submitted to the inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I will check into this and be very happy to, if it is in that form. It would be presented by our counsel; there was a Mr. Burtnick and Robin Scott, from the Attorney General's Department, who represented us. Whatever material they have, sir, I would be happy to—

INQUIRY REGARDING DISCONTINUED RAIL LINES

Mr. Lewis: Fine. When the natural gas hearings were on we had transcript and specific intervention. If it were possible it would be useful. Thank you.

May I ask the same minister, Mr. Speaker: Later this month the federal Transport Commission begins hearings throughout southwestern Ontario on reconstituting discontinued rail lines. Is it the intention of the Ontario government to make formal interventions to that commission inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this is the standing committee of the House of Commons. As a matter of fact, yes; we have been prepared to make representations for some several months now. It has been delayed since January, as the hon. member knows.

FORGIVABLE LOAN OBLIGATIONS

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Tourism and Industry: Is he aware that Mathews Conveyer Co. Ltd. in Port Hope is at this point unable to meet its obligations under a forgivable loan granted in 1968, by virtue of a contract award taken by the parent company in Pennsylvania—Rex Chainbelt, I believe it is.

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, no, I have no information on that particular case.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask, by way of supplementary because it has interesting ramifications, would the minister report to the House on it?

Hon. Mr. White: I would be glad to.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of the Environment has answers to questions asked previously.

WINDSOR PACKERS

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Bounsall) asked the following question: Why has air quality branch indicated Windsor packers are in compliance, and the people of the area are still complaining about the odours?

My information is that this source was the cause of many neighbourhood complaints about bad odours generated through the process of rendering animal waste for fertilizers. However, approved odour control equipment was installed and the problem practically eliminated. The residual odours resulted from the workers leaving doors of the plant open. The management appears to have corrected this.

The last complaint received prior to the one of May 19 was on October 30, 1970. Neither allegation was substantiated by the visiting air quality branch inspectors. This company has set up a voluntary monitoring programme using one of the most vociferous ex-complainants as a spokesman. The party has been authorized to contact the plant, day or night, as soon as an odour problem arises.

On inquiring of the assistant plant manager on May 19, he indicated that the spokesman recently said that the neighbourhood has been

odour-free for many months. Combined attention of the plant manager and the neighbourhood group should suffice to keep this situation under control.

Mr. Speaker: Please continue.

METRO TORONTO INCINERATOR

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, also last week the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) asked the following question:

> Since Metro council has just decided in favour of a traditional type new incinerator for its Commissioner St. plant because it could not negotiate with Ontario Hydro for the sale of the surplus steam to the adjoining Hearn plant, will the minister intervene with Hydro to enable Metro to justify the installation of a modern incinerator which converts the combustible garbage into steam and at the same time reduces the air pollution from the stack to a fraction of that in the traditional type incinerator?

Mr. Speaker, Ontario Hydro informed me that informal discussions took place between the city and Ontario Hydro. These were verbal and there was no record kept of them. Hydro informed the city that Hydro would entertain taking steam at Hearn from a new garbage plant if it were economically feasible. Hydro was prepared, certainly, to study the economics which would depend, from Hydro's point of view, on the intermittent nature of supply of steam, the quality of steam and the effect on present fuel contracts.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health also—a supplementary? Yes.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Will the minister pursue that matter to determine and give us a report on what an economically feasible proposition would be, since any revenue that would be received from Hydro would reduce the cost of the incineration?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned the other day, I'd have to get that information from Metro, which I am presently in the process of doing.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Singer: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health has the answer to a previous question.

SALE OF CHILDREN'S HOME PROPERTY IN HAMILTON

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) asked me on Friday about the future of the Rygiel Home for Retarded Children in the Hamilton area. I understand an offer to purchase has been made to the home, but the final arrangements of sale have not been completed. The governing board advised me that it is questionable whether it will be sold or not; but if it is, they are optimistic the new owners will allow it to continue as a home for retarded. As you know, my department funds it 100 per cent. It is a well-operated home; we are anxious to see its continuation and we will give it all the support we can to keep it in operation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister consider making an offer to the present owners on behalf of the Province of Ontario and purchasing the property, rather than continuing the present system of making a yearly grant of something like $50,000 each year?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, the grant is an operating grant as much as anything else, Mr. Speaker. At the present time, we don't want to get into the business of operating a lot of these homes ourselves. I think it is far better if we can continue operating under the board's system, as now; certainly we have not given any consideration to purchasing.

Mr. Deans: Another supplementary question: Is the minister aware that the parents of the children were informed that the only guarantee was for the year 1973, as far as continuation of the home as a home for children is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I was not aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure the hon. member that as far as we are concerned, we will give all the assistance we can to see that the facilities continue, even in new quarters if this one isn't available.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

POLICE REACTION TO INQUEST

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General if I can get him from behind his desk.

Could the Solicitor General explain to us the rationale behind the supervising coroner's ordering an inquest into the death of the lady who died in a parking garage in Royal York Rd. in Metropolitan Toronto? And now that the inquest has been held and the original opinion of Dr. Jaffe refuted by the coroner's jury, what is going to happen when the police say that they don't believe that in fact the lady in question met death by illegal means, that it was due to natural causes?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it was quite obvious from the reports that certain conflicting views were brought to the attention of the supervising coroner. He therefore ordered an exhumation of the body; an inquest was proceeded with and a coroner's jury's verdict has been arrived at. They have made their verdict, and I would assume that the police, in the discharge of their duty, will do everything possible to resolve the mystery of the death. This would be no different, for a death which is as old as this, as in cases of unresolved deaths which have taken place at other times.

Mr. Singer: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the police seem to have made it abundantly clear they have no faith in the verdict that the jury rendered and intend to proceed no further with any investigations, what really was the whole object of the exercise?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, Mr. Speaker, it has not been brought to my attention that, subsequent to the rendering of the jury's verdict, the Metropolitan Toronto Police have taken this position. That has not been brought to my attention. Is the hon. member bringing that to my attention? Is he aware of some statement by the Metropolitan Toronto police in this regard? If there is such a statement, I will take the matter under review.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister if he has not had an opportunity to review the various press reports, and particularly the evidence emanating from certain police officers where they indicated quite clearly, at least as I read them, that even if the jury brought down a verdict that the death had occurred by illegal means, other than by natural causes, they had no idea where they would begin to look; and in essence meant that they were prepared to accept the original opinion of Dr. Jaffe?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that there are two different things involved. One is the position that anyone would take, that there may have been a homicidal death but we do not know where to begin to prove who caused that. Another position is, to paraphrase the hon. member's words and question, to disregard the coroner's verdict.

I am aware of some of the evidence as reported in the press and as told to me by the supervising coroner's office. But I am not led to believe that the Metropolitan Toronto police would disregard the verdict. I would hesitate to assume such an early admission of lack of capacity on their part. I would hope they give it a try, which is their duty, and review the matter. Then, of course, it may end up in a solution; or it may end up with another unresolved murder.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A foolish verdict.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, could the minister ascertain from the Metropolitan police whether or not they are pursuing any further investigations; and if so, what kind of investigations they are now pursuing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: To reply to an interjection from the hon. member for High Park, I regard no verdict by five citizens of Ontario as being foolish.

Mr. Shulman: That speaks well of the minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say this, that verdict will be given the consideration that it deserves, and it is being given now. To the hon. member for Downsview, I will make—

Mr. Lewis: One of the finest verdicts in the western hemisphere

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will make that inquiry.

Mr. Deans: A question of the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: A new question?

Mr. Deans: Yes, a new question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East was on his feet.

PERIODIC MEDICAL CHECKUPS

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): My question is of the Minister of Health. In view of the long held decision in the field of medicine

that early diagnosis and periodic medical checkups were necessary as preventative measures, what is the minister's reaction to the statement by Dr. William Noonan, executive director of the Hamilton Civic Hospital to the effect that much of the so-called preventative medicines, such as multi-disease screening and periodic checkups, should be discontinued because it adds to the cost of health care while not giving any proven health benefits?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think, Mr. Speaker, that what Dr. Noonan was referring to was probably the abuse of the programme as it is today. As you know, the health insurance plan in effect in Ontario today provides for one complete checkup per year. We have evidence now, of course, that this has been badly abused by a certain percentage of our citizens who are going to different doctors and having a number of checkups during the year. I am sure this is probably what Dr. Noonan was referring to. There is no question that periodic checkups do pick up a fair amount of early disease, early malignancies, sometimes heart diseases, and so on; but by far the great majority do not pick up anything.

Mr. Gisborn: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that many of the associations—the Cancer Association and the Arthritic Association — recommend periodic checkups as a preventative measure for those diseases, does the minister not think that he should soften the effect of this statement for the benefit of the public of the province?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

FRENCH VERSION OF ONTARIO THEME SONG

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. I had occasion on the weekend to view on television the opening of Ontario Place and to hear the very beautiful Ontario theme song. I have inquired and I am told the theme song is in English only.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would come to his question.

Mr. Roy: Yes, I am coming, Mr. Speaker. I had to preface this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Just hang on!

I would ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, whether he would not agree that it would be proper to have a French version of the theme song for the half million French-Canadians in this province who are proud to be Franco-Ontarians?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, did the hon. member say half a million?

Mr. Roy: Half a million to 700,000.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I was going to say, I thought it was a little higher than that. I mean if the member is going to put in the request I thought he'd want to do it on the basis of more than that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: No; 650,000!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this probably would be more appropriately asked of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. It certainly is something I am sure he would like to think about and I would like to think about. We will have an answer for the hon. member in due course.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

SALE OF FIRECRACKERS

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Premier.

Does the Premier foresee his government introducing a ban on the public sale of firecrackers in the Province of Ontario; and will he request the appropriate department of his government, or any outside agency he deems fit, to establish proper standards for fireworks to be sold in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we haven't really contemplated the ban of the manufacture of fireworks or sale. Of course, this can be done with respect to sale under the jurisdiction of the local municipalities. Certainly, we have not, at this moment, contemplated the banning of the manufacture of them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deans: The second part of my question was would the Premier consider establishing standards compatible with the needs

of the Province of Ontario for the sale of fireworks in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really don't understand what one means by the establishment of standards compatible to the needs of the Province of Ontario. Certainly the question of sale is in the jurisdiction of the local municipalities; and a number of municipalities have developed, I think, quite appropriate control mechanisms.

Mr. Deans: Which cannot possibly work.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the hon. member is talking about the quality of manufacturing, what should be in them and so on; the answer is no, we haven't contemplated this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Will the government think about it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We think about many things.

Mr. Deans: Will the government think about it seriously?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

HIGHWAY 404 CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Deacon: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. When does the minister expect construction to commence on Highway 404 on the northerly extension of the Don Valley Parkway, which one of his predecessors advised us in 1969 could be expected to start in 1971 or 1972 at the latest? A lot of the people in those mile-long traffic lines are wondering when we are going to do something.

Hon. Mr. Carton: This is 1972, Mr. Speaker, and we're looking into it very closely.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

ONTARIO PLACE LIQUOR LICENCES

Mr. Shulman: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Can the minister advise me when he turned the food concessions at Ontario Place over to private enterprise if an application was made to the Liquor Licence Board by the new people for permission to handle those particular licences?

Hon. Mr. White: Certainly, they must have gone through the regular licensing procedure. That was a year or so ago, before my time. If details are needed, I'll be glad to get them for the member.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, I am referring to the transfer that took place just now, last month, from his department to the Ports of Call. Was an application made under the minister's jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, presumably there was, but I have no knowledge of these details. I'd be glad to them them for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Shulman: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If there was such an application, why was it not listed in the various applications? Would the minister also get that information?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

WEEKEND PARKING FOR PUBLIC AT DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR LOTS

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Would the Minister of Labour consider releasing and opening up the parking lots of the Department of Labour properties at the foot of York St. on Saturdays or Sundays for public parking. Would he not agree that it is sad to see families circling the blocks for hours, wanting a few hours of respite at the Island and being unable to park, when here are all those empty spaces standing there, barricaded off? Would the minister please look into that and consider opening them up on this coming weekend for the whole summer.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact of the hon. member for York-Forest Hill bringing this matter to my attention. I will look into it and I will report to him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

POLLUTION CONTROL AT BARRYS BAY

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment, regarding Adventure Charcoal Enterprises Ltd. at Barrys Bay: Has the company presented acceptable plans for pollution control for its proposed plant?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is my understanding the company has, Mr. Speaker; but I'll check and make sure and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Burr: Has it started construction as yet?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Burr: Has it begun construction?

Mr. W. Ferrier: (Cochrane South): What about that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I couldn't say whether construction has been completed. They've started construction; that was why they were fined in the provincial court.

Mr. Burr: As a final supplementary, would the minister table for us the maximum safe levels of the various pollutants that could be emitted from this plant?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, Mr. Speaker, based on the point of impingement, and so on.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

DRIVING TESTS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is it the policy of your ministry to require retesting of an individual driver who's been involved in three motor vehicle accidents in any particular year?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I'm not sure of the exact circumstances of the case the hon. member is mentioning, Mr. Speaker. But there is retesting where there are a certain number of demerit points, which I presume there would be in this case; or in cases where they reach a certain age, for example, 80; or in cases where they're 70 years of age and involved in an accident.

If the member will bring it to my attention, I'll look into that particular one.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the criterion for requiring a driver's test the loss of demerit points, rather than the number of motor vehicle accidents?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Again, Mr. Speaker, I don't know the exact circumstance of this case, but the deterrent is the loss of demerit points. Yes, because obviously one could be involved in accidents without, in fact, being responsible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

TASK FORCE ON LITTER

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, if I could catch the ear of the Minister of the Environment, who is not in his place? It's in reference to his statement earlier on anti-litter.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, the hon. member will realize that if the hon. minister is not in his place, he can't direct a question; although the hon. minister is now there, so he may proceed.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): He's an orangoutang today.

Mr. Germa: He was hiding under the balcony, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: He shouldn't have run back.

Mr. Germa: It's in reference to his earlier statement on his anti-litter campaign. Does the minister not feel that he is contributing to litter by using billboards, in that billboards along our highways are, in fact, a form of litter?

An hon. member: Is that the best the member could figure out?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that billboards are an accepted form of advertising.

Mr. Martel: They are getting rid of them in the United States.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not everybody is a great supporter of that form, but it is an effective one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore has been attempting to gain the floor. The hon. member for Lakeshore.

SUPPORT OF CULTURAL NATIONALISM

Mr. Lawlor: Oh! I thought I was out of bounds today, Mr. Speaker. To the Prime

Minister: What would the Prime Minister say, not so much to me, but to some constituent who phoned me and asked what on earth the Prime Minister meant by a speech he made in April at the Royal York Hotel, in which "the Premier's promise of more assistance to promote cultural nationalism, brought the only applause during his speech at the Royal York Hotel"? The Premier went on: "We should have more theatre and more Canadian involvement in the arts."

This man is a theatre buff and I said that it was far beyond my powers to seek to interpret the unfathomable and poker-minded thinking of the Prime Minister; and I thought I would let the Premier answer for the record himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member for Lakeshore has always been a very good advocate of other people's causes, and I really quite understand that he is asking this question on behalf of his constituent, rather than himself. Although I would think a man of his intellect would also be interested in the further development of Canadian arts and forms of culture. Certainly some of his colleagues are. I think the statement, really, which was not completely reported in that particular edition—the Star, I believe it was—

Mr. Lewis: Well, the applause cut the report short.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well the applause wasn't really related to that particular part of the speech, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Martel: Delayed applause!

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I won't go back and tell the hon. member, because I wouldn't want to prompt anything of a somewhat political statement on this occasion; but it was really prompted by something other than that particular statement.

I was just making the general observation, which I have made on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, when the main theme of a discussion has been about economic nationalism; a matter that has been discussed in this House and is taking the attention of a select committee, a very important issue. I personally have always suggested that there is the matter of cultural nationalism—

Mr. Lewis: Culture was pretty important, too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —which to me is, if not quite as important, in my view is almost as important—

Mr. Lewis: There is nothing like culture; nothing like culture!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as the economic side of the issue. And I have said, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It is safer, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm sure the hon. member for Lakeshore would support this; my personal belief is that students within the school system should be reading text books authored by Canadians, published by Canadians and, hopefully, printed by Canadians.

I also said, Mr. Speaker, in that speech, so that you can report with some detail to your constituent; I went on to say that, in my view at least, there should be more Canadian participation in the theatre. There should be more—

Mr. Lewis: That is pretty revolutionary stuff!

Interjections by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I really don't think it's that revolutionary at all.

Mr. Lewis: That is radical material the Premier is reading.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was really delighted the Star saw fit to print it, because I've said it on many other occasions. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I've said it in this House and I thought, really, the hon. member for Lakeshore might have remembered my earlier observations; but I did go on to say—so that you will have complete amplifications of the speech—that I felt perhaps it was necessary not just for government, but for people generally, to take a greater interest in the development of a Canadian culture.

I went on to say, I think, Mr. Speaker, and I am having to sort of tax my memory here because it was—

Mr. Lewis: Tax your mind.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh no! Mr. Speaker, the taxing of one's mind is something about which the member for Scarborough knows so little that I wouldn't want to comment here on this occasion.

Now, where was I before I was so—

Mr. Lewis: A very unpredictable reply!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, every response, Mr. Speaker, is unpredictable—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The Premier was taxing his memory.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now where was I before I was given that opportunity of assessing the intellectual capacity of the member for Scarborough West? Oh yes!

Mr. Lewis: He was dealing with culture.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was, something which the member for Scarborough West should be very familiar with, but there are some days on which I doubt it.

Mr. Lewis: So do I.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But once again, so that he can tell his constituents—this was in April, some time around the 19th I think; I am surprised he didn't raise it earlier, I say to the member for Lakeshore, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Foulds: The Premier had to be in the House to raise it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I suggested that one of the difficulties we face, as a jurisdiction and as a people, is that we do not give sufficient recognition—and I have said this before but I want the member to have the report completely accurate—that we do not give sufficient recognition to Canadian history, the accomplishments of Canadian politicians-statesmen if you wish this term—Canadian artists and what have you; and it is part of the philosophy that I think has to be altered. And that is there must be greater recognition given to the accomplishments of Canadians, and this of course includes many members here in this Legislature; and he can say that to his constituents.

Mr. Lewis: Well that is a landmark statement!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that sums up, in a precise form and a brief form, what it took me about 35 minutes to say at the Royal York some four or five weeks ago. If there is any further information, Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to see if a tape was made of the speech which I would provide to the member for Lakeshore so that he can more accurately communicate to his constituents.

Mr. Lawlor: That was one of the most trenchant, penetrating and zeroing-ins on the object statements that I have come across for some time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I knew the member would feel that way.

Mr. Lawlor: I want to know, as a supplementary—

Mr. Lewis: That was definitive, for the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly it was definitive.

Mr. Lawlor: As I said, his interest was primarily in theatre; has the Premier any concrete, specific notions, as to the theatrical field, as to whether he is prepared to subsidize it through Ontario grants or in any way? Or has he some notion of—

Mr. Cassidy: He is obviously training himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course the hon. member, I am sure, is very aware of the funds that are being allocated through the Ontario Arts Council, through the very persuasive dialogue in this House when all members support that sum going to the Arts Council every year, whereby certain aspects of the theatre in this province have been supported. We have also supported the National Theatre School, which is geographically situate in Montreal but where there are a number of Ontario young people studying the theatre.

We have done this through grants, through grants through other departments from time to time. We have done it to a certain extent through support in the book publishing field, which is not directly related to theatre but is related to that part of the speech to which the member was referring; and there are, of course, a number of other programmes.

I think it is also fair to state, Mr. Speaker, that not just government but the private sector, if I can use that term, should be doing far more to develop an interest in a corporate sense in the arts—if I can use that in the broad sense of the word.

I believe it is true that a number of corporations have in the past five or six years taken a greater interest, but I think there is still room for substantial improvement. I think they have the capacity to give encouragement to young Canadian artists, musicians, young people interested in drama and so on; and this to me would be a very excellent response from the private sector, as well as looking just to government.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, because it is a subject that intrigues me somewhat, but I hope this answers in some slight detail the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Speaker: In any event, the oral question period has expired.

Petitions?

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Carton presented the annual report for the Department of Highways for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this amendment prevents binding settlements or releases from being entered into by accident victims in haste or while under the stress of recent injury.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 27th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HEALTH
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2303.

On vote 2303:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We are treating this whole vote without dividing it—

Mr. Chairman: I believe it was being treated that way the last day we sat.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —because we are dealing with hospital management services and medical services. One matter I want to bring to the minister's attention is the programme that was discussed in the question period about a week ago as to the possibility of establishing advisory committees on a community basis that would have responsibilities beyond just public health responsibilities.

In my own community, and I know it has been repeated in other communities, there is a tendency for those smaller hospitals to be under some pressure, particularly from the larger regional hospitals, that perhaps their usefulness is at an end. And there are suggestions being made by physicians and others, some of them associated with the Department of Health, that concentration of resources both in personnel and funds be centred on regional hospitals that can provide a larger range of services.

I am sure the minister is aware of the dangers in such a programme, that centralizing services particularly for hospital treatment is detrimental to many of the communities that in the first instance provided these small hospitals through local subscription. The idea of centralizing their control only to close them down is simply unacceptable. I think a strong statement or a specific statement on this matter from the minister would certainly help in those communities where there is considerable apprehension.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Yes, Mr. Chairman, certainly there is nothing further from my mind than to close down these small community hospitals. I think I have mentioned that we are anxious not to have a duplication of services, and there is no way that we can provide in every community hospital all services that are provided in large hospitals.

I know this isn't what you are talking about, but certainly as far as I am concerned I am anxious to see the small community hospital continue to serve the community the way it has in the past, but I am not anxious to see it developed to provide the sophisticated type of treatment that can only be provided on an area basis.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, Mr. Chairman, under what auspices are these efficiency surveys taken? For example, in my own area there was a survey taken including all of the hospital facilities for Brantford, the town of Paris, and certain other facilities like the sanatorium, and while no specific recommendations were made there was a definite tendency to recommend that the Willett Hospital in Paris be closed down. This is symptomatic of what has been going on for some years. I am sure the minister remembers the same situation in the Grey South area, I believe, where there were statements made that led the local people to believe that their hospitals in the smaller communities were going to be closed.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Durham, Walkerton and Chesley.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Durham, Walkerton and Chesley are the towns that I recall as well. The then Minister of Health very wisely reversed his position, because the local people

weren't prepared to stand for it. But what I want to know is why money is being spent on these surveys when it doesn't appear to be government policy to phase these local institutions out of existence?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't believe the surveys that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to are carried on any longer. We are anxious, and of course I am anxious, to determine the actual bed situation of all types of accommodation in the province so that we can provide additional facilities in areas where there aren't enough beds and the various types of accommodations that are needed; we will continue to do this.

The local health councils I'm talking about are community health councils or district health councils like the type we have now in Hamilton and St. Catharines. And, as I said the other day, we will have them starting in Sudbury and hopefully Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay, Ottawa and other areas of the province as they ask for them.

I want local participation in planning the total health needs of that area and in making recommendations concerning the type of beds that are necessary, the types of facilities, the home care programme, self care units, mental health clinics, community health clinics and so on, to correlate the health needs of that area. I would like to get this in the hands of the local people.

I understand from the member's remarks the other day that some of this has already gone on in his own particular area, so he has a pretty good example of what can be done with local participation in providing this type of planning. Isn't that right?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I can't agree with the minister, because it depends on the definition of area. When you talk about the city of Hamilton and the city of St. Catharines, say, I can see there is a cohesive area where local participation would have a very good effect indeed.

But as soon as you look at area the way the Treasurer and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough) looks at area, then you are lumping many municipalities with independent goals, particularly for health services, and a nearby municipality that may have the weight of numbers and perhaps even the weight of tax base is going to say to a town like Paris, "Well, in the best interests of everyone your hospital is going to close up."

I think the minister must beware that in establishing these local health councils he is not in fact making the same mistake that his colleague in government is making when he approaches regional government.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, we certainly try hard to make sure we don't, Mr. Chairman, and it is certainly not our intention to make those mistakes. If they were made, I'm anxious, as you know, to see that these facilities are made available at the local level and I want to correlate them at that level to make sure that services are available to the public.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, what sort of evaluation of hospital care is being done by the department, other than one of receiving reports solely based on financial returns, to evaluate the quality of care? Does the department have people going out to do an accreditation or visitation, the same way that the Ontario Hospital Association used to classify the hospitals? Is there something being done on a much deeper basis than just the financial returns?

Hon. Mr. Potter: As the hon. member may know, Mr. Chairman, the Ontario Hospital Association established hospital accreditation many years ago, in which teams of doctors go out to accredit the hospitals themselves. More recently the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario requested, and we have granted them, authority to send teams of doctors into hospitals in the province. The team consists of three doctors—an internist, a surgeon and a family physician—and it is a different team each time. The doctors are taken from private practice, and in going into the hospitals they report to the chief of staff and they actually do an audit of the patients in the hospital. They check the patients' charts to make sure what type of care the patients are receiving, that they do in fact need to be in the hospital, that they are using the hospital facilities properly, that they are not over-using facilities such as lab and x-ray facilities and so on. That now is being carried on by the College of Physicians and Surgeons at their request.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, is there a published report of the results of these visits so that hospitals get an opportunity to compare what is said about their particular hospital with, for example, a hospital in a neighboring community? Is it possible for the community to get an idea of just how well their hospitals are performing?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this being a new programme—it only started within the last two weeks—the report will be submitted to the local hospital board, to the medical and surgical advisory committee of the board, to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and to myself.

Mr. Deacon: So, Mr. Chairman, those reports will be public and available for the newspapers to talk about.

I am delighted with this because I was quite surprised a year or so ago when I had a complaint brought to me about a situation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. For many years it had provided a very fine service for chronic patients here in Toronto but in recent years its condition had certainly deteriorated to a very, very serious extent.

I took the time to pay a visit on my own to the hospital and tour around and I found the state of repair within that hospital just abominable. It showed a lack of interest in repairing broken walls and plaster; the one area that did appear to be well looked after was the office accommodation, but when I went into patient areas I was really discouraged. This hospital for years had had an excellent reputation, but in recent years I found that — perhaps because they thought they were going to get a new building—they let the old building go down.

Another comment that was made about the situation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital by someone who had been on the staff for many years was that there's a new principle that has been pervading the administration of hospitals around the province. That is, to have a non-professional administrator take over and then he or she hires the experts to run the hospital. As a result, with a tight budget they cut out many expenditures on maintenance and things like that that have kept the building in good condition.

But I would hope that this group that is coming from the College of Physicians and Surgeons would look at more than just the patient care. I hope there will be somebody taking a look at the general condition of the building and reporting on that.

Perhaps a lot of the trustees when they come to the meetings don't go beyond the boardroom to see what is actually going on. This is more apt to happen, though, in a big centre than in a small community, such as the one of which my leader has just spoken, where I am sure the local trustees are well aware of what is going on right through the whole institution, because it is on a much more intimate basis.

Another area that I wanted to ask the minister about is one that I brought to his attention, at the Lion's Head Red Cross Hospital and other Red Cross hospitals, where, I gather, the situations sometimes call for emergency service on the part of other than a medical doctor. Because of very strict orders from the Department of Health, or from somewhere, they are not able to look after the emergencies there, even though they have people who are perhaps qualified to do a certain amount of the work that the emergency calls for.

In nursing stations in northern Canada, certainly I know in talking to nurses on the staff that they often are called upon to do things that they just would never do if a doctor were present. But when there isn't a doctor present, surely there should be some power or latitude given—authority given to those in charge to take care of the situation the best way they see fit.

We shouldn't cause the conditions to prevail in an area such as Lion's Head, which is quite a long distance from Owen Sound, where someone would die because of some strict rule. I would appreciate the minister's comments on this.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, this is a good example of where a nurse practitioner, I am sure, could provide the type of emergency treatment that the hon. member is referring to. This is something that we are at the present time exploring in various parts of the province and I'd like to see something started in that area.

As far as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is concerned, as you have suggested, a very small portion of the hospital is in a decent state of repair. The rest of the hospital is due to be reconstructed starting next year. Funds will be made available in 1973 and that is the reason why no money is being spent at the present time to try to improve the old facilities, which are really beyond repair.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

I'm just wondering, as a suggestion, if we might complete the discussion of item 2, hospital management services, before we move to medical. Is yours on hospital—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I am not sure. I am going to ask the guidance of the minister. I just wanted to clear up the matter of

the nursing home, the Rygiel Home, which he mentioned in the question period. I wondered if this would be an appropriate place to—

Hon. Mr. Potter: As good as any.

Mr. Deans: It is? Good. I just want to clear up what it is that is worrying me about it, so that we both understand.

The parents of the children and the people who have worked in that facility in order to make it what it is have been informed that at the maximum, they could—well, not the maximum, I shouldn't say that. They have been informed that the only guarantee they have is that the home will be maintained as a home for children until the end of 1973.

Now the province is fairly heavily involved in it. They have put up a lot of money to maintain the operation and what I am concerned about is that if in fact they continue to put into it what they have been putting in the past, and the new owners decide to turn it into a nursing home for the aged, or any other kind of facility that they see fit, or sell it, or whatever it is that they want to do with it—it is a choice apartment site—then we have to start at that point scrambling to find a new facility.

It's the only facility of its kind in the Hamilton area. It has provided a tremendous service to those people with retarded children. The people of the area have been just beside themselves with joy about having that facility there and being able to go and visit their children, to take them out, to provide on a volunteer basis the backup services necessary to make it so successful.

What I am really suggesting now is that since it is for sale, it might make sense for the province to inquire about purchasing the building, leaving it to be run by the local board—leaving it to operate just as it now operates, so that it can continue to provide exactly the same high level of operation that it has. At least we would then have the final say as to what happens to it.

If it is found that it is no longer suitable, we can phase it out and move the children to another better facility in the immediate area. It will still be worth as much money to us as an apartment site, or a home for the aged, or any other kind of facility.

I just hate to see the risk that we are taking, being taken. I feel very badly that maybe in 1974 we'll look back—and the minister may say to me, "We won't allow it to happen," but so often I have seen it happen and the minister may not always be the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has brought up a good point. This is a good home and we are very interested in it. We pay 100 per cent of operating costs. We haven't put anything into it as far as capital costs are concerned. We are anxious to see it continued.

At the present time there is an offer to purchase which is still binding if it is carried through. We certainly haven't had any idea of purchasing it ourselves. We are, though, in touch with the board continually and we are determined that we are going to have the operation continue, even if it is in new quarters.

I don't think that the relatives of the patients in this home have anything to worry about. We'll certainly see that we do all we can to keep them in business.

Mr. Deans: Well, just one final—

Hon. Mr. Potter: No matter how else you put it, that is the way it's going to—

Mr. Deans: Yes, thank you. I am prepared to accept your assurances, because I know that you will come through. I'm worried that you might not be there when the occasion arises, but nevertheless.

There has been a—

Hon. Mr. Potter: I hope I shall be here for two months.

Mr. Deans: You never can tell. They are sitting behind you waiting to pounce at any moment, so don't make a mistake!

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Short stay.

Mr. Deans: The problem is that over the years there have been a number of promises made by the Department of Health, and by the Department of Social and Family Services, that there would be another home for retarded children in the peninsula area; one that would take the place of Cedar Springs—I think it is Cedar Springs—not take the place but be complementary to Cedar Springs, and provide a facility for children in that area more readily accessible to the parents.

That never did materialize. They have been promised it and promised it and promised it. It just never seems to come about. They are becoming just a little sceptical and I can understand it. You get a little sceptical after

a number of years and you begin to worry that you are not getting the exact truth all of the time.

I hope the minister is always in the position of being able not only to assure us but to follow through on the assurances. Maybe he could tell us a little bit about when we could expect this other facility. Maybe that would help set minds at ease, too.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I'm afraid I can't mention the other facility right now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): There are two matters that I would like to ask the minister about. The first has to deal with the chaplaincy services within the hospitals of Ontario.

I understand that certain hospitals are financed to the extent of $5,000 to provide chaplaincy services. We have had one in the Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital for the last couple of years and the presence of a permanent full-time chaplain has been an invaluable service to people in co-ordinating the work of other clergymen and priests within the community. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, he has it organized so that there are always a couple of local clergymen on call to come at times when they are called for and needed. Not that the chaplain thrusts himself upon people but I believe he does do invaluable work.

The problem is this. To provide this service, I understand the hospital has to ease the financing of this into its other general administrative expenses as I believe only $5,000 of his salary is approved by hospital management services for payment by the department. I believe in one or two exceptions in Toronto a larger portion or the full salary of a permanently employed chaplain is provided by the government.

Would the minister comment on whether he believes this service should be expanded and whether it is providing a vital service within our hospital administration? I personally think it could and it does, where it is. I think an expansion of this facility in our whole hospital programme development would be a very good thing.

Hon. Mr. Potter: For many years, Mr. Chairman, there was no contribution from the Hospital Services Commission toward hospital chaplaincy services. When the plan was started, it was agreed that this was the amount that was to be put into the estimates and that was it. It has never been given any further consideration since that time but it's a matter that we might take under discussion with the hospitals and the chaplaincy services. At the present time, the $5,000 is the fee that was provided and was agreed upon.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to do a little inquiring. I understand that most of those serving are very highly qualified, specialized types of persons who deal in a multi-purpose fashion. as social workers, consultants at times of very great emotional strain, at the time of sickness and at the time of death.

I would think that by talking to hospital administrators the minister could very quickly find out that they are fulfilling a very great need. I personally think an expansion of this type of service within our hospital setup would be advisable.

The other matter that I would like to ask about has to do with dialysis units in hospitals around the Province of Ontario. In my own area, Kitchener-Waterloo, the nearest service is in Toronto. I don't know if there is one in Hamilton but most people have to come to Toronto. Even people who have their own artificial kidney machines in their own residences still find that there are frequent trips necessary to Toronto for expert advice, for adjustments and repairs. To keep the whole thing functioning it is imperative that one be close to a dialysis unit such as they have in many of the larger centres. I believe by actual count there are some 40 people affected by this in the Kitchener-Waterloo area, and I think approaches have been made to the administration of the Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital to see if a unit could be set up in our area.

The hospital services in the Kitchener-Waterloo area have been expanded tremendously in the last number of years because of the great increase in population. Duplication, I believe, has been avoided to a considerable extent between St. Marys and K-W Hospital, and I think many people who require these services—both those who have to come to Toronto on a weekly or semi-weekly basis and those who have their own machines at home—find that it would be very advisable, in fact almost necessary, that in the near future a specialized unit of this nature be set up at the Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital. Does the province have any basis on which it says, "Yes, this hospital in this area should have an extended service in the

artificial kidney area," and provide funds for it, or does application have to be made by the hospital concerned if it wants to extend its programmes and facilities to include a new section of medical treatment such as this? How is this worked out?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, any programme such as this is going to involve considerably more capital expenditure and operating funds, and naturally they'd have to apply for permission from the insurance programmes to do this in order to fund it properly. You will also appreciate that it is impossible to establish this type of unit in the vicinity of everybody in the province who needs it. Transportation being what it is today, it is much more economical and much more feasible to transport patients.

In this particular area, with the growth that has gone on in the Kitchener-Waterloo area, I think it is an area where we might well consider having a dialyser put in. But, at the same time, I think you will appreciate that we can't do it in every municipality, in every local hospital. In this particular instance, the hospital itself should make application to the commissioner for this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to talk on that point regarding the dialysis machine. About a year ago, Mr. Minister, we were trying to get one nurse trained for the Sudbury area to assist those patients who have to go to Hamilton and then journey back home. Has the department now got someone in Sudbury adequately trained for this type of service?

Hon. Mr. Potter: You haven't got a dialyser in Sudbury yet, but there is one planned for the Sudbury area.

Mr. Martel: Right. But the problem last year was that there wasn't even a nurse who could assist the various patients who had the machine at home, in the event of a problem, or should they have to come to the hospital for the eight-hour treatment, there wasn't even a nurse trained. I have attempted to get a nurse trained in that field by dealing through the nurses' association. I don't know if this has been successful or not yet. I wonder if the minister could indicate?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is my understanding that before anyone was set up with the home dialyser someone in the family was trained to operate the equipment, or there wouldn't be any point in putting it in. By the same token, there is no reason why if any particular area wants nurses trained in it, if they let me know we will see that it is done.

Mr. Martel: It was my understanding, particularly in the case I was dealing with, that sometimes he had to go to the hospital and stay there for the treatment, and the problem was that there wasn't anyone in the Sudbury area skilled to be there with him at the time. I was attempting to get the nursing association to have someone come to Toronto. I understand part of the problem was that there are no grants in order to train someone to have the expertise necessary. I am wondering if there is someone now qualified in the Sudbury area to assist the patient in the event of some kind of emergency or so on?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think the hon. member will probably agree that one of the problems we have in the Sudbury area is lack of co-ordination. Once this is established, as we hope it will be in the near future, we will have all these matters settled up there.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a couple of questions.

One is relative to a new phenomenon that has happened in the city within the past year. One of our hospitals, the General Hospital, has taken on the services of a public relations officer. I just don't know how widespread this is across the province, but we do know that public relations officers are very expensive people. This fellow I'm talking about was a top-notch beer salesman, and now he's in the General Hospital, and I think it's costing us a big buck. I just wondered to what degree this is being spread across the province? Is it really necessary? Do we have to sell hospital services?

I have a natural aversion to PR boys because they seem to varnish the truth, and I think in the case of our hospitals that we should get the unvarnished truth. I don't think that you have to encourage people to attend a hospital; because if I need a head transplant, I am going to go without somebody talking me into it, you see. And I just wonder how much money this is costing us? Has your ministry accepted this philosophy and what is your opinion on that one?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It doesn't happen too often, Mr. Chairman, but really the purpose of the PR man is not to encourage the public to use the hospital facilities. If it is done properly, it is to advise the public of what the facilities are, how they should be used, what happens when they are abused and over-used and so on; and to advise them what to do in the case of an emergency, where to go, when and why.

And at the same time, this has happened in some areas—not only for this particular purpose—but to assist at fund-raising and sometimes to assist in collecting old accounts.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, the second point: I have had communications with the minister on this. It's not a medical problem; it's this problem of television rentals within the hospitals.

Now, I did receive your missive and I did accept all the reasons that you gave. For the safety of the patient and the convenience of the nursing staff and various other reasons, it was probably a good idea to have these small units which don't interfere with any other patients.

The point I want to raise though is the price these people charge who supply the service. I think $500 a year is quite a high rental for a six-inch television set. You know, $1.35 a day plus tax comes to something over 500 bucks a year. And you know it was explained by the company that no one stays a year; no one pays the $500, but it is accumulative. I think that maybe before we grant a monopoly in a public institution built by public funds, we should be able to negotiate a better price. It seems to me like it is a bit of a rip-off to pay $500 a year for television service.

I think it is a good service for convalescent patients. Certainly if you are only in there a week, $1.35 a day probably wouldn't hurt you too much. But if you happened to be in there for two or three months, there are a lot of people who just cannot afford it and would have to be denied this sort of convalescent assistance.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think in the majority of cases the TV rentals and expenses are run by the women's hospital auxiliary; sometimes by the hospital management board of governors themselves. They enter into a contract with the suppliers and then the hospital itself gets back a percentage of the rental fee, which is then available to it to provide other services not covered under the insurance programme.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, has the minister in the last month or two allowed any new nursing home licences in the province? And, if not, does he contemplate that there may be any new licences issued? I am thinking of one in particular that has been a nursing home up to about a year ago, and its licence was transferred to another home; and now they have applied for a licence for this particular home. What is the situation throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No new licences are being granted, Mr. Chairman, until I have an opportunity to see what the particular needs are in each particular area of the province. And then the new licences will be granted strictly on a case of need. There haven't been any recently and there won't be until I get over my estimates and get an opportunity to study the needs in the various areas.

Mr. Ruston: In other words, when you get all of the applications processed—do you have a lot of applications from people who have been in hospitals or chronic care hospitals and have not yet been transferred to nursing homes? In other words, what you are saying is that when these people are all processed and moved, if they are eligible, into nursing homes, you will look at the situation as to whether you need more licences; is that right?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, that wasn't what I was saying, Mr. Chairman. What I was saying was when I get an opportunity to study the needs, to see what the future need for nursing homes is in any particular area. At the present time we have a whole pile of people applying to operate nursing homes in the province, even though there are others who say they can't make money at this.

There are a great many anxious to get in the business but by the same token we have to make sure that there is need for the beds in that area. This will be done by surveys of the hospitals. It is one of the things that these teams are doing when they go to hospitals now. They are supplying us with the information to show us how many of these patients can be cared for in nursing homes or under the home care programme and so on. On the basis of these findings, we will go ahead and provide more beds.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): On the same point, Mr. Chairman, specifically in

relation to the municipality of Leamington and the application of Komoko Nursing Homes Ltd. I believe a year and a half or two years ago a licence, or the indication that a licence would be issued to Mr. Bartlett of the Bartlett Nursing Home, was given by your department. Subsequently his operation was purchased by Komoko. The municipal fathers have rezoned the section in the municipality to accommodate the building but still no permit has been issued. I wonder if the minister will give me an undertaking that this might be one of the priority areas since that municipality did have a nursing home. It doesn't at the present time and there is an apparent need in this case.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Certainly, Mr. Chairman. If there is a need, it will be given high priority. I think the hon. member will understand that licences are non-transferable. If somebody has a licence to operate a nursing home, he can sell the facilities but he can't sell the licence.

Mr. Paterson: I believe there were some extenuating circumstances involving these two parties that your officials are aware of. I trust that this one can be given priority.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would be glad to—

Mr. Chairman: Still on item 2—

Mr. Martel: Yes, on hospital management services, I want to join with my colleague from Sudbury in bringing forth a problem. I know full well the minister is aware of it but I want to put it on the record because we are going to face a rather difficult situation in the Sudbury area in the months that lie ahead.

I am afraid we are going to be accused of being anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant, anti-French, anti-Irish and anti-everything if the minister intends to move ahead with what he has indicated to me. I simply want to tell him that we on this side are willing to support him all the way down the line. I have gone to various groups of people who represent the vast majority of the municipality and who are dissatisfied with the delivery of services to the residents in the Sudbury area and the outlying area.

I speak, of course, of the hospital situation which, in my opinion, leaves so much to be desired that it would be comical if it wasn't so serious. You have to go to a hospital and get a Catholic blanket to be covered with, otherwise it is the wrong type of blanket. This bothers me no end because in checking a year ago with a number of the doctors in the Sudbury area we found such things as waiting lists for 100 patients waiting for heart surgery; or 80 or 90 patients waiting for surgery for an eye or a nose problem. It just goes on and on and the problem becomes more acute because the hospital boards continually fight with one another.

The fact is, it is so ridiculous I sent the minister a letter recently—he hasn't received it yet—wherein I am advised that the St. Joseph's Hospital has written to the board of the new Laurentian Hospital to assist in the phasing in. My colleague and I discussed it as we were coming down today, and we weren't even aware there were two different hospital boards; it was our impression that they were simply taking over the new Laurentian Hospital.

You've got this internal fighting and, of course, the only people who are suffering are the people who are waiting for a bed. As the Catholics and the Protestants and the French and the Irish fight with one another—not the people, but those on the boards—everything gets tied up in the boardrooms and nothing gets done for the people. Laurentian Hospital has been on the drawing boards since 1964, I believe, and it won't be completed—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Too bad we didn't leave it there.

Mr. Martel: That's right. It's in the wrong place. They are building the hospital to serve the doctors, I guess. The three hospitals are within—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Not the doctors.

Mr. Martel: Not even the doctors? The three hospitals are within a stone's throw of each other. Three hospitals in a city are located in the same place, and the people who come in from the surrounding areas, such as Capreol, Hanmer and Val Caron have to go right through the city to get to one of the three hospitals. And nothing is there for the patients.

The situation has reached a critical stage; as I say, they have been planning Laurentian since 1964 and it won't be ready until 1974—10 years from the drawing board to fruition. I am told they've spent over a million dollars already on architectural fees alone. What kind of nonsense is going on up there?

I only join with my colleague and the minister in saying that we are prepared to

lay it on the line to some of these little groups and little cliques that have run the show up there, that it's time they disappeared from the scene and people who are interested in delivering services to the people, in consultation with the hospital board here in Toronto, will do everything to assist the minister in that vein.

Hopefully we will get hospitals that are planned to be in proper locations within the city, hopefully we will get things for chronic patients, hopefully we will get a number of convalescent homes so that we don't have our general hospitals with waiting lists of six, eight and 10 months just to get in. In fact, the only time you get in is in an emergency; otherwise you are on a waiting list a foot long or a mile long—I am not sure which it is, it doesn't really matter when you wait that long.

But the situation has reached a critical stage, and while I'm no medical man—I have no expertise in this field; I am only a layman—the setup as it now exists is so badly planned it boggles the mind.

The other thing I would like to talk about, and perhaps the minister could answer, because I have written him for additional grants just for operating costs this year. I understand that they have slashed—maybe I am in the wrong vote, Mr. Chairman; if I am, I would—

Mr. Chairman: You wrote for grants for what? Had they anything to do with hospital management?

Mr. Martel: Yes, for the operation of a hospital. The department has cut back—

Mr. Good: Right on for once.

Mr. Martel: Right on?

Mr. Chairman: Give it a try.

Mr. Martel: Well, the minister's department has not answered to my satisfaction, because in fact they have cut the grants at the General Hospital. I wouldn't mind if they were cutting off secretarial help at the General Hospital or, as my colleague has said, the PR man, but when you have to cut the nursing staff—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: Oh, but they are.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is the hospital's decision.

Mr. Martel: That might be the hospital board's decision, Mr. Chairman, but again it is the patients in the Sudbury area who have been short-changed. I could list a number of things that have gone on, in St. Joseph's Hospital, for example, that would boggle your mind, such as patients falling out of beds and no one being around to put them back or giving patients one type of gas improperly and rushing them to another hospital to fix them up.

I think if we are going to cut back, and the boards are making that type of decision, then that is all the more reason why those boards can no longer exist. Just recently I talked to a number of nurses who are simply being run off their feet, they don't even have adequate staff on the floor to provide the patient care that is necessary, and of course they are the ones who get the dirty end of the stick. Both the patients and the nurses are being deprived of the right type of care. If it means direct government intervention to guarantee that the nursing staff isn't cut, or people in the x-ray rooms, then I suggest that the minister is going to have to get his people to move in directly and say:

"Now, just a minute, of the 15 people you've laid off, 14 of them you can't afford to cut off. You might cut a secretary, or you might cut someone else; but you are not cutting off the nursing staff or the technicians. There is no way the hospital can operate."

In fact, the General Hospital now operates, I'm told, at 94 or 95 per cent capacity. To have a reduction in staff operating at that type of capacity is ludicrous. It is absolutely ludicrous. As I said to the minister when I wrote to him, "I just don't go around asking for grants off the top of my head. I know money is short."

In this case, I would ask the minister that his staff review where the cuts have taken place, and if they are in the wrong place then I can only ask the minister once again; either that he force them to change or he give us some green stuff with which to operate that hospital at full capacity.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think the hon. member should be made aware, Mr. Chairman, that there was no cutback on the funds to the hospital. That hospital receives a seven per cent increase, the same as every other hospital in the province; and, of course, if the volume of activity went up, they got more than that.

When they are talking about being cut back, they may have been cut back on the budget that they presented. But they were limited to a seven per cent increase, the same as any hospital in the province. Of course,

this forces hospitals to use better management techniques and improved procedures. In many cases, this is exactly what has resulted. As the hon. member mentioned, if they aren't capable of that, then it is going to be necessary to see that somebody else is in there who is capable of it.

We have discussed this previously and I will repeat today: I think the situation in Sudbury is one of the worst in the province. As we have heard here this afternoon, it is absolutely necessary that we do have a proper health council established in that area in order to plan properly and correlate the health needs. I am confident that this will be in operation before too long.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on item 2?

Mr. Paterson: Yes, Mr. Chairman. A few months ago the minister's committee on the inquiry into hospital privileges reported to him and certain comments were contained in the thrust throughout the province. I am just wondering if the minister would comment on about five of these particular proposals that were made at the time? Specifically, I might put the five points to the minister so he will know the ones that I am particularly interested in.

The first recommendation was that the board of trustees have the overriding authority on the appointment and discipline of staff; second, the procedure for the appointment of doctors be standardized; third, that the applicant be entitled to full reasons and a full hearing by the board if its recommendation is not favourable; fourth, that a hospital appeal board be established as an independent provincial body and, lastly, that doctors' qualifications should be reassessed annually.

Would the minister care to comment on these particular matters?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, as the hon. member is probably aware, I am prepared to bring in legislation very shortly covering all these items. Standardizing procedures for staff appointments; the reasons they are turned down; the right of appeal to an appeal board, and so forth; these will all be covered in the legislation that will be brought in very, very shortly. As far as the last question—what was the last one?

Mr. Paterson: The last question was regarding qualifications.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh, qualifications, yes. This is a matter I have been speaking about on several occasions recently. I have spoken to the annual meeting of the OMA, to other meetings of doctors and the Ontario hospital associations around the province. You may or may not be aware that the College of Family Practice in the province is the only college that I know of now that has continuing education as one of the requirements of belonging to the college. This is a matter that is now being reviewed by the College of Physicians and Surgeons to determine whether or not it would be advisable that this was one of the essentials of continuing licensing in the province for any of the specialties, not just family physicians, and I think that this is something that is most important.

Mr. Paterson: Actually what you are stating, Mr. Minister, is that the OMA would more or less police its own group rather than having another body that would examine the competence?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The College of Physicians and Surgeons is the licensing body and it would operate the same as the College of Family Physicians at the present time; when you renew your membership you have to send in certification of spending so many hours of continuing education over the past year. The College of Physicians and Surgeons at the present time are looking at this to determine if this wouldn't be feasible to incorporate into the licensing of all physicians in the province.

In other words, at the first of the year when I want to renew my licence it would no longer be possible for me to send in my $200 or $300, whatever it is, to get my licence back if I wasn't prepared to produce evidence that I had so many hours of continuing education this year; and indeed go a little bit further than that and produce evidence that I had been practising good medicine and I was using the facilities properly and in the best interests of the people of Ontario. If I wasn't prepared to do that then I think they should look pretty carefully at my licence and say, "Maybe we are only going to give you a temporary licence for three months until you smarten up a bit, and if you don't smarten up then you won't have a licence." This is something the college is looking at now and I'd like to see them explore it a little bit further.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on item 2? If not the member for Parkdale has a question of item 1, which has not been formally carried.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): I would like to ask a question both on items 1 and 2.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on.

Mr. Dukszta: Is there any plan at the moment, Mr. Minister, of doing a cost analysis of who gains from what is described as public health programmes—let's say OHSIP? Is any research being done in the department right now?

Hon. Mr. Potter: At the present time, Mr. Chairman, no. We are having a busy time at the present time trying to determine how effective the programme is, how expensive it is, where the money is going. There is no way I could make a commitment to bring in a report like that right now. I'll be tabling the report very shortly on the OHSIP programme from the time of implementation in 1969 until last March with the introduction of OHIP, but I haven't got any study such as you suggested under way at the present time.

Mr. Dukszta: I have a specific reason for saying it, because there is a study in the USA—and I know how sensitive people get when a USA study is mentioned, but it is a very interesting study which relates directly to what I would describe as the enormous expenditure which we now give out for our hospitals. Part of the money spent on a hospital obviously goes to the hospital itself but some of it must go to the practising physician and this is what I would like to refer to. Who in fact gains from public health programmes?

There is a study done by Dr. Stuart, who is in Michigan, and he analyses the economic impact arising from the introduction of the two American health schemes, Medicare and Medicaid, and the impact it had on both federal and state budgets. What he was interested in doing was a modified cost benefit analysis. If I digress for the moment, this relates directly to what we were discussing in the item prior to this, how little money has been spent, or is being spent, or is proposed to be spent on the environmental health hazards and how we are escalating our expenditures on acute care.

So this particular modified cost analysis of Medicare and Medicaid, if I can quote directly, "was to show the effect on programme recipients, non-recipients and physicians," and was done from 1966 to 1968. It showed, for example, that in the US scarcely 56 per cent of the $14.8 billion spent on the two programmes represented gains to the recipients. The interesting item here is that over the same period physicians received average net gains of between $5,400 and $7,400 more than would have been the case in the absence of both programmes.

I think the implication of this applies very much to all of our programme. The major implication is that the physician gains immensely from the introduction of this programme, which is underestimated both by the medical profession and is underestimated, I think, by the government in planning for the amount of money necessary for hospital costs and physicians' costs. I think that needs to be seriously looked into, since part of the escalating amount of money that we're spending goes directly and unnecessarily to provide the extra emolument for the physicians.

I have returned to this topic repeatedly. It's an important point when the minister has answered me on four separate occasions that there was no money for what can be considered in many respects a top priority in health needs, including, for example, a study into the effect of noise on the general health of the inhabitants of Ontario. I don't really think there needs to be an answer since the minister has given an answer that he hasn't really done this type of cost analysis.

I would like to go now to the second item here, which is hospital management services. I think the commission of inquiry into hospital privileges, the Grange commission, probably properly belongs here. I would like to discuss a few issues involved with that, though I am aware that the minister said that there is new legislation going to be introduced which, I assume, will correct certain of the deficiencies in the self-regulating practices of the physician and also of the board and hospitals generally. You're aware, I think, that the improper control of hospital privileges has thwarted and made difficult the formation of community health centres, both in Ontario and elsewhere. Under the circumstances, it seemed necessary, I think, to break the proprietary concept of hospital control and replace it with an awareness of the trustee responsibility before further developments in the field of community health centres can take place.

When I looked at the summary of recommendations in the report of the minister's committee of inquiry into hospital privileges in Ontario, I gathered, if I am correct, that the control will be finally vested over the hospital privileges, or the final board of

appeal will be the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario. The only thing I'm not quite clear about is whether the hospital appeal board will be in any way independent of this or not. If it's not—maybe the minister can answer when I finish—if the final board of appeal will be the College of Physicians and Surgeons then, in fact, we are vesting once more, all the control over who gets appointed to the hospitals, not in the community or in the community board or community body where it rightfully belongs, but in the body of physicians.

I am not sure that we can, in fact, change in any respect what's already going on in terms of appointments to the hospital, which is the control by a few physicians over the others. I think there must surely be a more independent body set up which would include as members, representatives from the community or so-called lay people who will have something to say about who gets appointed to their community hospital. I realize a differentiation may have to be made between a teaching hospital and a community hospital; but couldn't the minister maybe answer me whether in his planned legislation there is any allowance for a somewhat more independent voice to be made and to be included than just the physicians and the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what we are planning. I should also point out that the Americans are in a different situation than we are entirely. Their medical aid programme hardly compares with the programme we have in Ontario. It covers mostly the aged whereas our programme covers all ages.

At the same time, it is rather intriguing to hear the hon. member's comments about community health services and the community clinics and the programmes advocated by our American counterparts. Within the past two or three weeks I met, at their request, an executive of one of our larger trade unions. He pointed out to me that the chairman said he had been instrumental in establishing the community health clinic in St. Catharines; that it was a mistake; that it was designed for Americans and that they were so far behind us they couldn't compete in this province.

Quite frankly, when I was up there a couple of weeks ago they were pointing out to me that they couldn't continue to operate efficiently unless we allowed them to tie into the programme other people outside the unions, rather than just those who were participating from the unions. While we have a long way to go in improving our health programme in the province, I don't think the Americans have much to offer in the way of suggestions on how we can improve things until they smarten up a bit themselves.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, I used the only reference available in terms of cost benefit analysis, which is the Dr. Stuart study. I am perfectly aware that, in fact, Medicaid and Medicare are different from what we have here. The system in Ontario which you have now extended to nursing homes is indeed more comprehensive. The fact is that it doesn't change the fact that the study shows that the physician gains. If the physician gains under the very modified and very small American system, he gains just as much under our much more extensive system. That is the first point. I think your response to this was incorrect.

I don't think you dealt at all, nor did you answer me, about who is going to be on the hospital appeal board or who is going to control the appointment to the hospital. You have given me again an interesting point about the two trade union originated community health centres, and I accept your point. I can add, actually, one more criticism to it and that was that they never originally had a multi-disciplinary approach but started with an intensely physician-oriented approach which was a mistake.

I think, conceptually they should have accepted from the beginning that if you organize a community health centre, it should have a multi-disciplinary approach not a physician-oriented one. It is a mistake from which we hope to learn. I understand that the latest developments in community health centres in Manitoba have already allowed for this extension to social workers and to other people to provide extra services for community health centres.

May I just ask you again, when you are stepping up your legislation to control hospital appointments and hospital privileges, whether you do propose to have any community representation on it or whether you intend to leave this in the hands of the physicians or the Royal College of Surgeons?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think the hon. member will agree, Mr. Chairman, that the majority of the members of the boards of governors of hospitals are community people. Medical

staff are represented by two or three at the most.

The hospital board will have to make the decision about appointments to the medical staff of the hospital in consultation with and on the recommendations of the medical-surgical advisory committee and the credentials committee. The appeal board will be a separate board which will be set up, of course, outside the College of Physicians and Surgeons, I expect.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on items 1 or 2? The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in this brief period of time, slightly over an hour, on this particular section of the vote we are approving an expenditure of approximately a quarter of the provincial budget, that is over a billion dollars. I think we realize that most of this is a fait accompli as these are existing and very worthwhile programmes that must be carried on.

It's quite difficult to compare this set of figures with last year's estimates book due to the changes in the departmental structure. There are a couple of questions that I would like to ask in relation to this. I notice in this particular section the increase in the dollar amount; it is up approximately $125 million, but there is a decrease here of $10 million in capital financing assistance. I assume this is in relation to the construction of active treatment hospital beds, or does it go beyond that? If it is related specifically to this area, is it because of the change in policy of bringing in the nursing homes and so forth to get people out of the active treatment beds and because we don't require the use of large capital funds? Just what is the reason for the cut in this particular section?

Hon. Mr. Potter: As I said before, we are going into the nursing home business and exploring other methods of providing care of patients better suited to their needs than active beds. We have cut back temporarily until we can determine just what is needed, if anything, in the active treatment area. We have, as you know, many programmes under way this year and some approved for next year. We have cut back on some of them hopefully until we can get a better look at the overall picture of need before we continue to spend more money on active treatment beds.

Mr. Paterson: If there is a requirement for more millions of dollars in this area, I assume it could be brought in on supplementary estimates.

One last question in relation to this section, Mr. Chairman, is in relation to the two amounts of $100,000 for indigents from unorganized territory, and indigent immigrants. I think the department and other agencies have carried on a good programme in making immigrants specifically aware that they can purchase short-term health care insurance through the private carriers when they land at our borders, and certainly there is an onus upon the sponsors of these immigrants coming into the country.

I wonder if this is just a normal statutory amount the department sets aside for emergency? And actually how much was expended, say, in the last fiscal year of the $100,000 appropriation for indigents?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We share with the federal government the cost of immigrants coming into the province, and this $100,000 is just about on the line with what we paid last year; we have the same thing in the estimates this year.

Hopefully the federal immigration people warn new immigrants before they come in here to take out the insurance. It doesn't always happen and as the member is aware, very often they land here and we don't know anything about it. But we are hoping they will continue their programme in trying to advise them before they leave their homeland to take out the short-term insurance so that when they get here, they will be covered until their insurance takes effect.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on items 1 and 2? The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Again, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if this is the appropriate place—I never am—but I am a little concerned about what has happened in the area of training nurses. Does it come under the hospital administration?

Now that they have changed the fee schedule and the nurses are going to have to pay, I was under the impression that some kind of arrangement for payment was going to be made through the hospitals to the nurses in training in order to compensate them for the additional cost to them.

Is this to be handled through the Department of Health or is this to be handled through the Department of Colleges and Universities?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is in this year's estimates; it is being transferred this year, as you know. In this year's estimates we have the costs; next year it will be in Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on items 1 and 2? If not, item 3, medical services, in vote 2303. The member for—

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, in this vote I would like to discuss the supply of doctors in the province. We find there are sufficient doctors in the cities, but in the rural areas there seems to be a considerable shortage in many towns and villages. Could the minister inform us if there is going to be a supply or if he is taking any action under the programme that the department had last year in regard to encouraging doctors to establish in towns and villages outside the metropolitan areas.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We covered that last Thursday night or Friday; if you don't mind.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 then? Vote 2303 then is carried?

Vote 2303 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2304, psychiatric and retardation programme. Any discussion? Carried?

Mr. Deacon: No, Mr. Chairman. No!

On vote 2304:

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: On 2304, I wonder if the minister could tell us much of the changeover in —I presume this is the one that Cedar Springs and all the hospitals come under?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Yes.

Mr. Deacon: As such, it has to do with the mental health division; Dr. Henderson's operation? What has been the changeover in staff that has occurred in the health centre in Toronto. It seems to me that there have been several changes in the last few years in the director in charge of the mental retardation centre in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You mean in Toronto? Do you mean in my ministry; or where?

Mr. Deacon: I guess I should have that directory with me that gives me a list of the various operations, but there is one in Toronto that has to do with the main clinic, I understood—

Mr. Gaunt: At 999 Queen.

Mr. Deacon: No, not 999 Queen St. It has to do with children's services.

An hon. member: Clarke psychiatric?

Mr. Deacon: It is not the Clarke Institute. It is directly under the department. Unfortunately I thought I had the right file with me to go into this, but I find I don't. The director of it was brought in from the States a year or so ago and then released. He was the third or fourth director of that centre in the last three or four years.

Mr. Lewis: Where is the centre?

Mr. Deacon: In Toronto. I thought they called it the mental retardation centre.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, that it what it is called.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, what do you want to know about it?

Mr. Deacon: Well, has the minister any explanation for the continual changeover in directors; the problem they've had in staffing that centre?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, apparently the director who was there when the programme was started, left to go on for further studies. A second director was appointed, and he just hasn't worked out too well. Now we are looking for a third one. Is that the one you are talking about?

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I think if the minister will look into this, he will find that there are three or four who have changed in the last few years and they may give different reasons for moving. I know one of them. He was brought in from the States and then released because he didn't work out; as the minister said, it apparently didn't work out. But previous ones have left.

I think as the minister looks into the situation, it probably is due to the difficulty in relationships between the administrator and the professional person. I think they call the professional the director of treatment and training; I think that's the name for him. But he is working under the administrator, who is not a professional.

It points out the problems of a policy the department instituted a few years ago. So often, professionals are not competent to handle administration.

But in the operation of hospitals there is a way of coping with this. They have the professional staff on one side, working

through the medical committee; and the representatives of the medical committee on the hospital board. And they have the administrator appointed to the board, and he has certain responsibilities for administration; but the medical staff is not under the administrator. They have their own direct line of communication to the board.

I understand that in connection with this particular programme the administrator has been the boss and has been for some years and is creating a lot of problems having this form of operation; whereas here, I feel, the minister should look into having the responsibility for professional treatment and everything to do with professions going directly through into the department, and there would be no question that the administrator is not their boss, when he is not a professional.

I would ask the minister to look into the problem. I think he'll find that the fact that there has been this structure where the administrator has been directing professional staff, and trying to tell them what time they report in in the morning and things like that, and going far beyond the normal responsibilities, has been very, very bad for morale. I think if the minister investigates the situation, he'll find that there are people who would be glad to work at this type of work, but they're not going to do it under the conditions that have been prevailing in this branch for some time.

I think that the man in charge of this branch should be asked to account for what's been happening. The minister should take a good look at a change in the authority. There's no question that the administration certainly has to be efficient, but it should not be at the expense of good, professional work.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: This is just an aside remark. One of the attractive things that has recently happened in the Department of Health is that administration is, in fact, I think, totally responsible for all the services, including the professional ones. If you are, in fact, going to attempt to control the professionals at all, maybe you should relate them to what you describe as a lay person. I hate, in fact, to defend the minister on this point, but it's an interesting idea. If you're going to control the professionals they should relate to someone called lay. It almost relates very closely to what I would advise for the general hospitals which is the control by the community. I know it's hardly appropriate here, and I should really go straight to what I wanted to say to the minister.

Before I make a couple of remarks on general and programme administration, I would just like to ask a question about what was originally promised by the then Minister of Health (Mr. Wells) in respect of the Children's Mental Health Centres Act. I would like to have some information as to whether this has been implemented and what has been done, how much money has been given toward it, etc. The then minister, on Jan. 21, 1971, when he was announcing the new Children's Mental Health Centres Act and regulations, which were to come into effect on April 1, 1971, said:

> It will add strength and momentum to the programme being developed in Ontario to provide all children with the finest possible services for the prevention, treatment and care of mental disorders. [He said also,] The Act recognizes the importance of special services for children within the mental health programme for Ontario and under the general direction of the Department of Health and provides for the co-ordination, inspection, licensing and funding of all mental health facilities to serve this age group. [Then he said,] The Department of Health will assume total responsibility for financing treatment programmes. This means Children's Aid Societies will be relieved of paying fees for their wards. It also means municipalities, through their share of Children's Aid Society budgets, will be relieved of a responsibility costing $1.4 million.

Can the minister give me answers how far all this has progressed since the statement by the former minister?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Since January 1971?

Mr. Dukszta: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Potter: First of all, as of April 1, 1971, there were 13 facilities transferred to Health under the Children's Mental Health Centres Act. In the Department of Social and Family Services there were eight with a total of 334 beds. There were five from federal mental health grants—6. By March 31, 1972, there were nine new programmes completed, or at least four new ones and five expansions. The four new ones provided an additional 54 beds; the five expansions provided another 51 beds. There are 11 approved for expansion, which are under way

now, to provide 100 beds and there are 120 planned for development. The total cost amounted to a direct cost of $8,875,912.

Mr. Dukszta: How much?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Plus the grant of $11,042,000, so the total cost is $20 million.

Mr. Dukszta: All right. Thank you very much for answering this. What about the question of Children's Aid Societies being relieved of paying fees for their wards? Has that gone through?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They don't pay any fees now.

Mr. Dukszta: They don't? Okay.

Mr. Lewis: No, wait—Children's Aid Societies still pay a fee to place a child in one of the treatment centres, if it is not a treatment centre under the Children's Mental Health Centre Act. They still pay a fee for residential care in institutions or settings that are not under that Act.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: All right. May I point out, Mr. Chairman, the extraordinary anomaly of this legislation has been that since it became possible for direct private referrals to go to treatment centres without the route of wardship through the courts, a number of places which were previously used by children's aid societies have therefore been precluded from such use because they have been picked up by the private direct referrals, which is all to the good.

God knows we needed the beds but what has happened—and this is really an irony which the children's aid societies can barely cope with—is that the institutional budget of the Children's Aid Societies, instead of being reduced by virtue of this Act which was expected to take up so much of the cost, has in fact been increased as the Children's Aid Societies scramble frantically around trying to find appropriate settings for placement when there are no further beds left in those institutions which are designated under the Children's Mental Health Centres Act.

I was recently talking to the director of the largest Children's Aid Society in the province who told me that the deficit situation for institutional placement through the societies is, if anything, even more aggravated than it was. What does this mean? It means that for Children's Aid Societies, the area of the programme that suffers is always the preventive area. That I suppose is the area which is immediately expendable.

I remember being in the Legislature when we debated the Child Welfare Act. The regulations included—I guess it was under a section of the Act; it wasn't a regulation—gave the Lieutenant Governor in Council, by way of regulation, authority to do preventive counselling of a kind that Children's Aid Societies had never done before. They had thought about it for many years and were delighted to receive it.

Now a number of years later, by virtue of an Act which was designed to free Children's Aid Societies from the economic hardships of institutionalization, they find that as a percentage of their budget they are spending more money on institutional arrangements which are less preferable for children as disturbed as they were before, and that their preventive section of the budget is not adequately served. It raises a very real anomaly and I don't pretend that it was necessarily seen in advance.

All of us applauded the Children's Mental Health Centres Act because it was a really important piece of social legislation. It is just that it is on the books and that it is being used by families who go to the Scarborough Mental Health Clinic or to a private physician and have direct referral to Maryvale in Windsor or to Browndale in Haliburton or Sacred Heart Children's Village in my own riding or God knows what other area.

What has happened to the Children's Aid Societies is really very severe and requires looking into, if necessary through the Department of Community and Social Services because they are now in an impossible situation. If my colleague from Parkdale will allow, the minister could talk to me about that, based on whatever it is that Dr. Henderson has given to him.

I would very much like to pursue one other aspect of this—do you want me to do this now?

You had as of April 31, 1971, 334 beds; as of March 31, 1972 you had 54 new beds in new programmes and 51 in expansions, which is 105 and 334 is 439. You have 11 new expansions totalling 100, which would be 539, and you have 120 beds planned for development, which would be 659. And with the greatest of respect, Mr. Minister, 659 treatment beds do not now exist. We are really talking about 539 at the moment—539 treatment beds in the area of severe disturbance continues to be ludicrous.

I think that there is sufficient evidence for that as reflected in (a) the waiting lists of the various treatment centres themselves; (b) the frantic situation of the Children's Aid Societies in Ontario; and (c) the extraordinary report which was prepared by your own children's mental health division. This report demonstrated the situation in the year 1970-1971, which has not altered significantly, about the problem of finding settings for very disturbed, acting out adolescents and other multihandicapped kids and how grim the situation continues to be in the Province of Ontario and how anxious they were that such settings be found. So, I must put in the caution that the programme has by no means exhausted the capacity to perform; it is still short of that.

May I throw in another point, Mr. Chairman, which perhaps runs counter to what the department feels. And I can say something to you, Mr. Minister? I have never seen a more dramatic rejuvenation of an entire field of social neglect than has occurred latterly through the children's mental health division.

As a person—and I want to speak to you personally—as a person who struggled and suffered through a very difficult period when the mental health division of the Department of Health, and your predecessors in the Department of Health, were acting as obtusely and indifferently and insensitively as is possible for politicians to react about emotionally disturbed kids, I find the change in the children's mental health division stunning and I for one want to give it really full support.

What has happened in that branch in the last two or three years is exciting and it is important. I cannot commend it sufficiently. It is as though a torrent of fresh air swept through the entire field and as someone who is in contact from time to time with mental health agencies, with treatment centres, with adolescent units in OHs, and who is in contact with Children's Aid Societies, let me tell you, Mr. Minister, that it is one branch of your department with which they all collectively enjoy dealing, even if all the problems aren't solved.

That is quite a transformation from the situation that occurred from 1963 to 1967 where it was worth your life to persuade certain of your predecessors that there was a mental health problem for children at all in the Province of Ontario, let alone one as grievous as subsequent reports demonstrated.

Having said that and having in a sense by saying it deferred to both the efforts and the wisdom of the branch—and I am not even going to be critical, which you anticipate by my prelude—I am simply going to say that I raise the question about the way in which money is spent on developing facilities. It still strikes me as rather more oriented to institutional settings than it is to residential and cottage settings.

When you talk to me about an expenditure of $8 million for the creation of a relatively modest number of beds, then I immediately envisage a large extension to existing plants, or a new plant, and I am personally persuaded—and here is the presumptuous novice making a point, but I will make it anyway—I am personally persuaded from what I have seen around Ontario, Canada and US jurisdictions that it is possible to treat even the most profoundly disturbed kids in the community, that it is usually the community which is at fault if it doesn't work rather than the kids; if not the community then the municipal politicians.

One of the greatest single contributions which this government could make through its Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is to pass an amendment to the Municipal Act saying that no municipality in the Province of Ontario can limit by bylaw the right to have a residential-setting group home or other similar facility in a community or municipality. That would be the greatest single contribution to this field, to break through the municipal impasse and the refusal of municipal politicians to adapt to reality.

If you were able to do that and if the zoning bylaws were abandoned, and all the prejudicial nonsense which surrounds this were abandoned by act of the Legislature, by an act of faith on the part of politicians, then it would seem to me that you could expand these programmes without having always to rely on large plants, recognizing that a number of very small settings are equally important.

Now I know your children's mental health division supports that view and I know they would do everything they could to extend it, and I know that they are often blocked by the legalistic and bureaucratic realities out there in the field. But if it isn't too presumptuous of me I want to make that point to the minister, because if he sets in with his walking-on-eggshells capacities, which have a certain notoriety and affection from time to time, then perhaps we can get a change in the law and perhaps we can get a redirec-

tion of finance. You just don't have to spend that kind of money on building.

If the minister will forgive me, there is still in the cabinet of Ontario a predisposition to large buildings. When the Act came through the House of Commons on the juvenile offenders the reaction of the then Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman), was: "It will cost us $20 million in new buildings." It was a spontaneous, Pavlovian reaction on the part of the minister, who immediately saw the need for buildings as the only answer to an increased number of offenders which would fall within Ontario's jurisdiction. And that is poppycock, because it is possible to treat people in other than these large institutional settings and to do it much less expensively and much more effectively.

That sort of makes the various points that I wanted to bring on this subject. I don't know how the mental health division got shaken up but it sure did occur, and the head of the mental health division sitting across from you, Mr. Minister, has immense support from this politician and this party in the House in whatever she endeavours to do in that branch. I profoundly hope I haven't now prejudiced her position beyond rescue, but willy-nilly she still has our support in what she is attempting to do. That will not prevent us from asking of the policy makers, the minister and company, why it is that certain things aren't happening. Perhaps you can range vaguely over the various observations that we make?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me assure the hon. member that the problems that the Children's Aid Society is confronted with we realize are there. The children's service branch is meeting with the Children's Aid Society to see if we can't solve their problems for them, or at least offer some assistance.

I must say that I too, and the department generally realize that we must provide more beds of a residential nature for this type of patient in many areas of the province. As you have already stated, the director of this branch has been promoting this programme for some itme, and it is my hope that in the near future, as we go along, we will develop the programme of getting the children out of the large institutions and into a more residential type of accommodation around the province.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make clear that my comments about the role of the administrator vs. the professional do not mean we should go back to the old system. I am thinking in terms of the hospital board, where when there is a problem between the administrator and professional—I want to make this clear to the member for Parkdale—there is a board consisting of both that can resolve the situation. These conflicts do exist at times, but I just don't feel that an administrator should be bossing the professionals and be responsible for that side of it—no more than the administrator of a hospital should be deciding what operations should be undertaken.

In connection with the small homes mentioned by the member for Scarborough West, I wonder why it is we require expensive fire regulations such as fire escapes and all types of things in the buildings that identify the house as being other than a home. When we are trying to look after and care for these youngsters in a residential setting, why can't we make it a residential setting?

We have now a programme in Markham under construction to provide residential accommodation for mentally retarded youngsters. We want that to be part of the residential community and yet the fire marshal's regulations insist that they have fire escapes and all types of things like that. These aren't large institutions; they are houses. Why should they be any different than normal homes?

As long as we are moving in this direction, can't we also be sure that the community isn't faced not only with the extra expense but by those homes blighted with that mark which shows them to be an institution?

We have very high expenses in connection with these homes in Markham, only because of some ancient concept of what is needed in an institution. When we are trying to build institutions and we are trying to make a home setting, let us recognize that families live in two- and three-storey homes too. There may be some risk of fire, but the risk of loss is not very great, and we are adding to costs and lowering the quality of the programme as a result.

A third point: I've had complaints from people living near the Thistletown hospital of damage done to property as a result of youngsters getting out of the institution. Is there provision for compensation to people in a situation like this? I realize it is difficult to control, but it certainly makes it difficult for farmers in the neighbourhood when they

find damage done to their buildings as a result of these youngsters getting out.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't think there is any arrangement for compensation under these circumstances. Certainly I sometimes wonder whether these youngsters cause any more damage than the ordinary run-of-the-mill youngster who has a habit of going around and destroying property.

Your other question, the second one, what was that?

Mr. Deacon: About homes and fire regulations.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, I couldn't agree with you more. Sometimes I wonder what the fire marshal is doing down there, trying to make it very difficult in some of these instances. I see no reason myself why we have to have special fire doors or fire escapes if we have children living under as normal as possible home surroundings.

As you say, it has been a habit in the past to make them put up outdoor fire escapes and make them look like an institution, but I'd be delighted if we could convince the fire marshal to ease up a little bit on these regulations, because I don't think they're necessary.

Mr. Deacon: Well, we will do all we can to support you.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't think there is as big a risk for these children living in a home as there is for them riding down the highway in a car.

Mr. Lewis: But it is—

Mr. Chairman: No, no, is the hon. member finished?

Mr. Deacon: I just want to finish off on this matter of the youngsters in the Thistletown hospital. I don't know whether there is any great damage—I know there has been lots of damage caused by other youngsters to farm buildings—but it so happens there has been a rash of problems out that way with youngsters getting out. Is there not a policy provided by the government?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Deacon: There is.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister about those children on the waiting list for the hospital schools for the mentally retarded. I believe the minister's prodecessors told us last year there were 500 on the waiting list and, since this minister has taken over, a couple of fathers and mothers in my own area have told me that he admitted their children, which certainly was greatly appreciated. I wonder if the minister can inform us how many are on the waiting list this year. Has that number increased or has it gone down?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's 378.

Mr. Spence: He has done very well.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks, express some concerns and some criticism, and throw a few kudos toward the minister. Maybe one should start with the criticisms so that one ends up on a nice note. I would like to look at manpower in the psychiatric field.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Where do you find it? I would like to look at it too.

Mr. Dukszta: Good, I will help you then. The situation in psychiatric fields here, especially in Ontario, is probably almost as bad as it can be in any other discipline. It shows not only a geographical skew, which I think has been typical of the situation of all physicians and dentists, but I think it also is compounded by the predominant nature of psychiatric practice, and that is my concern at the moment.

We in Ontario haven't done that many studies on exactly what the psychiatrists do, but most of the evidence available from both Canada, Ontario and the USA show that a majority of the patients that psychiatrists treat, often up to 80 per cent, are seen by them in their private offices.

Now that tends to suggest the patient is ambulatory and says something about a diagnosis that brings the patient to see the psychiatrist. It suggests that the patient then is probably largely neurotic, and because of the system of referral of patients to psychiatrists, it tends to be largely middle-class in origin. Often because of the time the psychiatrists see their patients, those tend to be more often female than male.

I am not sure of the exact figures but this is the general pattern, which suggests that in fact the more seriously disturbed individuals in the psychiatric field often don't see the psychiatrist, though they do end up

in psychiatric hospitals. I am not particularly concerned about this, because I will end up by saying how one could deal with this.

Given the present pattern of psychiatric practice, I think, it is especially difficult to estimate the number of psychiatrists that are necessary to provide consultative services. Estimates have ranged, I believe, from one psychiatrist per 5,000 people to one psychiatrist per 50,000 people. It depends where you stand. For the English-speaking population in the city of Montreal, for example, the distribution is one psychiatrist per 5,000 people. This obviously does not apply up north in Ontario, but the present pattern is such that it effectively removes most of the psychiatrists from dealing directly with disturbed individuals.

When the hospital commission started paying psychiatrists, I think it accentuated this particular pattern of psychiatric practice, in which the people who went through the usual referral channels (which is from a general practitioner to a psychiatrist) were largely middle-class and largely neurotic. The setting up of psychiatric units in general hospitals, though laudable in its intent, in its attempt to make mental illness "more acceptable to people," ended up because of the insufficiency of funds, or bad organization or otherwise. Only some people can really be treated in general hospitals while the rest get sent off to mental hospitals, which are considered, generally, to be inferior in treatment, though I personally have reservations of that.

As far as I am concerned, it's the fact that the department usually provides better service than the general hospital psychiatric units. That's a blanket statement I know since I have worked in the system. But, unfortunately, characteristically, for example, in Toronto, admission to a provincial psychiatric hospital is by police referral, while admission to a general hospital is largely by referral from a physician.

I am very concerned about this, since I have worked in the system, that when the police pick up somebody whom they consider odd, unusual, or different, or where there is a complaint from the neighbours or the family, when the police are involved, then they tend to take the patient to Queen Street mental health centre. If it is a middle-class individual, obviously they tend to call a physician first or a psychiatrist or whoever is available, and he usually ends up in general hospital. So, willy-nilly we have ended up in having a two-class system of medical care, specifically in psychiatric practice in Ontario.

There has been a problem, I think, for the large hospital, like Queen St. mental health centre, and it has set up serious resentments both in the patient and the staff as to why it should be this way. If you look sociologically at the type of individual who is admitted to Queen St. Mental Health Centre, it invariably has been a lower-class individual on welfare, an indigent "socially or otherwise," which I think suggests that the psychiatric units in general hospitals, in spite of the enormous money poured into them by the department, which goes into the capital funding and into the provision in payment of psychiatric services, have not been pulling their weight. They tend to choose what they want to treat and, roughly speaking, when you look at the type of in-patient population of these psychiatric units in general hospitals, they are largely middle class.

I feel this is something we must look more closely into. Now possibly the building of the new "fantastic" facilities at Queen St. Mental Health Centre may correct some of it, but I suspect that it would need more than just the building new buildings because the reputation of the Queen St. Mental Health Centre—however undeserved it is—is that is a lower-class facility, the end of the line, etc. That has to be corrected probably by a much more active role of a policy maker, which is you, Mr. Minister.

We have, in fact, subsidized the middle class solely. What OHSIP and OHIP now are doing is subsidizing middle-class individuals when they need psychiatric care. We have not really done much to help the lower-class individuals. I know that recently we have expanded the range of what is a psychiatric problem until it includes educational problems, recidivism, and many social problems up to a point where, say, 20 per cent, using this as a modal estimate, of our population has some kind of "psychiatric" problem, in a sense psychiatric-social, social-emotional, or social by itself. People have gone as far as saying 80 per cent but I think that is nonsense. It is related to the way they estimate their problems more than anything else. This is a criticism that I have had.

I would further like to express some appreciation and credence toward the department and then express some concern whether this is still the policy and whether the minister could assure me that this will be going on.

In a number of the hospitals of the Ontario Hospital system, like, let's say, the hospital in Penetang, the hospital in London, the hospital in Hamilton and the hospital in Toronto, a number of fairly exciting programmes have been going on which fit very closely, I think, to what you have been suggesting of using the so-called ancillary—I hate that term—but using the other mental health professionals in providing the service.

For example, it must have taken a lot of courage on the part of the minister and the minister prior to you to support such a controversial project as the one going in Penetang, however valuable it is, in fact, scientifically; however valuable it is in terms of effect. It is very controversial and other people have been critical. I find that it is very exciting that people have been prepared to go on in spite of a lot of questioning of what has been going on from, maybe, somewhat reactionary and biased people.

At the Queen St. Mental Health Centre there have been two major and very interesting programmes going on. One, I think, was probably more exciting than the other one. Unfortunately, maybe I had less to do with the one which was more exciting than

The one with which I had something to do The one with which I had something to do was on the usage of all off-the-ward staff, which is professional staff, as primary care workers dealing directly with the patients who are admitted to the hospital, with psychiatrists acting in an advisory consultative and medical supervisory capacity. The other programme was to use nurses in the same capacity.

Originally, when the psychiatrist was the only person who was a primary care worker there was constant complaint from all the patients that they never got to see a psychiatrist, never had any help, nobody ever saw them. The moment when those two programmes came into effect, the patients who, at first, objected to not seeing a doctor or not seeing a psychiatrist finally did accept that the psychologist, the social worker and the trained occupational therapist can be as good in delivering mental health care. Really, there is nothing mysterious about it and it can be done by people who are trained in other health professions just as well as by a psychiatrist and often better.

Why I am concerned about this development is because in spite of what the minister has often said—that he supports this type of approach—I've had disquieting notices from various sources, specifically the University of Toronto's department of psychiatry, that there is now pressure being put on and that the psychiatrist should return to the controlling overall position that he occupied prior to the establishment of these programmes.

This does concern me very much. It does, obviously, concern the people who have been working in the system. For the last three or four years, the system has been working reasonably well, and there has been more satisfaction for the patients in the Queen St. Mental Health Centre than before. The Queen St. Mental Health Centre has developed a reputation for being very advanced and a very exciting place to work in spite of the fact that it has never really had enough psychiatrists. The people who are working there, the psychologists and social workers, are becoming concerned that there is so much pressure being put on, maybe partially by the department but largely now by the university's department of psychiatry, to return to the "proper treatment" for a psychiatric patient, which is being seen by psychiatrists, and with psychiatrists being involved in the total control over the whole field.

I do hope that the minister can reassure me on this point, that this is not happening. I must give him information that in the University of Toronto, under the chairmanship of Prof. Hunter, there has been a very strong move toward what I call "medicalization" of all psychiatric services and contempt expressed toward usage of the ancillary workers, psychologists and others, as full primary care workers.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that in the whole health field there is a big need for the use of auxiliary personnel. We have been trying to promote this, and I can certainly assure the member that as far as I am concerned, there will be no return to the old system.

In the first place, we can't get enough psychiatrists even if we wanted to. When he spoke earlier about psychiatrists and supply of psychiatrists—if anybody can give me any advice as to where I can go to get some psychiatrists, I would be delighted to have it. We're badly understaffed with psychiatrists in most of our mental institutions, as you are aware. No matter where we advertise—money doesn't mean anything any more, you know that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not to you MDs?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I got out too soon.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We could arrange a return.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't think you could. It could happen though, you know.

Really, I would like to assure you that as far as I am concerned, we want to continue their use. It is a team effort all the way through in the health field.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Dukszta: I would just like to thank the minister. I do feel reassured and I think obviously those words will be read and appreciated by other people, especially in the Queen St. Mental Health Centre where there has been some expression of concern about the rights and privileges and the work they have been doing. This is as good as a recommendation that the work they have done is good and that they should go on with it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate the minister's views on legislation which is presently in the statutes of the province, in regard to the maintenance of patients in our Ontario hospitals and our special home care.

Never in my 17 years have I been called on for this purpose, but this year I have had two cases where the husband has been asked to account for his wife's keep in the Ontario Hospital at St. Thomas and for special home care. There are no assets other than the home and I understand that your department does take what you would call a delayed action against laying claim to a man's home.

It seems to me that there are many who go through life without contributing too much. They don't have any home ownership and they are not called on to pay anything, and yet the man who has made a sacrifice and has his own home has to come along and foot the bill. So I think, Mr. Minister, that some consideration should be given to taking this off the books. I think it is out of touch with present-day society to try and recover this.

I certainly feel that, when there are other people who contribute nothing and one man has made the sacrifice to have his own castle, it shouldn't be taken away from him and his family in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is right, Mr. Chairman. As the hon. member has mentioned, under the Mental Hospitals Act, a patient is liable for his own maintenance and a husband is liable for his wife's maintenance once she is in the mental hospital.

We are currently reviewing the areas of mental health and homes for special care legislation as it relates to this. The review now is being carried on by the ministry's financial and legal area and I hope that recommendations will be made by the end of June that we can have some changes in the legislation to provide this type of care.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: No, I will defer to the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, well, we'll go to the member for Grey-Bruce and go to the member for Sudbury East after.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Thank you, Mr. Minister, we have an acknowledged great shortage of psychiatrists and we have then, which follows, a great oversupply of beds in the mental hospitals. I know in our area we have one or two wings that are not being used. Across the province you may have three or four thousand empty beds because this type of thing is happening. Do you have such a thing as a computerization of vacant beds—as in the hotel industry, where they have computerized hotel vacancies across the market?

Why couldn't you, in the hospital field, make these unused beds available for hospital cases and save these months of waiting?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We are doing this in some areas of the province at the present time, where there is a need for more active treatment beds, or for convalescent beds, whatever it happens to be. We are just in the process of doing this in Thunder Bay at the present time, and we'll do this in other areas of the province too. As we study the needs for an area where we find we have either psychiatric beds or TB beds which are no longer needed, then we'll make them available for other purposes. It will ease the strain.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Minister, we all know what the cost of a hospital bed is, running anything from maybe $20,000 or $30,000, and if you have 3,000 rooms available, you are talking many hundreds of millions of dollars in cost to the province. I think it is a shocking thing that you haven't got the technology already implemented here in this very important need.

You say you are starting to do it in certain areas; but it is not enough. I don't thing it is enough to make a spot deal; this is not right. You should do an overall crash programme on it if you are going to save and do a job for the people. The member for Wellington South made a very valid point. I'm glad the minister is going to take a good hard look at this. Are you going to look at it in June?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is being looked at now. I hope to have the report by the end of June.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, one thing more, Mr. Minister, insofar as retarded people are concerned who can't get into institutions. There are many thousands of people across the province who are in homes and unable to be moved. They are imbeciles who can't go to school; or complete vegetables who are a drain on families across the province. Do you have any programme in mind, Mr. Minister, to take the mountain to Mohammed, as it were. Can you go to them, the parents, and take the load off them someway in the home?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well this is the type of programme that we are developing now. I anonunced a few weeks ago that we were starting one in Sault Ste. Marie along the lines recommended by the northeastern Ontario report. By the same token, we are providing facilities in other areas of the province, like Picton. We are starting one very shortly at Oakville to help provide some assistance for this type of thing.

Mr. Sargent: Is there anything on paper that I could see about that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I just thought that one up.

Mr. Sargent: I wouldn't put it past you. What have you got that we can look at? What's that note you have got? What does that say?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Hon. Mr. Potter: This says we have 90.4 per cent occupancy in our mental hospital system in the province at the present time. That's on an overall provincial basis.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I would like to question the minister and maybe get some answers as to what is going to happen in the Sudbury area. I presume you knew Les Frost, Mr. Minister, and he—

Mr. Chairman: That is not in this particular vote.

Mr. Martel: It is on this particular vote, Mr. Chairman. Les Frost made a promise in June 1959. It was election year and he indicated then that after all the years of study that in the Sudbury area there was going to be a school hospital for retarded kids. Great fanfare, Mr. Minister. Well, it is now 1972.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is a new league.

Mr. Martel: This is a new league? Okay. I am glad the minister says it is a new league. Now, seeing that 13-year-old promise has gone by unfulfilled—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: —I am wondering—and I know you have got a report out—when, Mr. Minister, you will start to put a little together in the Sudbury area to satisfy the needs in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Just as soon as we get the Sudbury area working together as a team to promote and provide the health needs for that community. Remember we agreed on that.

Mr. Lewis: What a slander.

Mr. Martel: You see, Mr. Minister, I am hoping and waiting. I get these promises from various cabinet ministers. We had one when the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) indicated two years ago an on-going committee on mining safety. It is not there.

Hon. Mr. Potter: This is Health. It has nothing to do with Mines.

Mr. Martel: It is not there. No, the new minister promised, and it's not there. When can we expect that the minister will then start to move ahead? Maybe he could give a date or get a number of people on that committee to get it started. I can name you a few who would be willing to help.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am hopeful that the Medical Officer of Health from that area, who has been out of the country or he would have been down here last week, will be down to see me just as soon as he gets back and we will get started on planning that in council.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2304. Carried?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I hate to continue this—

Mr. Chairman: It being 5 o'clock p.m. would the House leader like to move adjournment?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

NOISE POLLUTION ACT, 1972

Mr. Burr moves second reading of Bill 59, An Act to Control Noise Pollution, 1972.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have here an article from the Toronto Telegram of Feb. 23, 1970, entitled "There Is No Escaping Noise, the Unseen Enemy." In this article is the interesting sentence: "Last week Ontario Resources Minister George Kerr put this province ahead of the rest of Canada with his announcement of projected noise control legislation."

Mr. Speaker, this article overlooked the fact that Alberta and Quebec already had laws setting limits to the amount of permissible noise. Quebec had already established 85 decibels as the maximum industrial noise level, and required ear protection devices "where needed." Alberta already had set maximum levels to which a worker could be exposed; 12 hours at 85 decibels, six hours at 90 decibels, and one minute at 112 decibels. Where these limits were exceeded the noise must be suppressed or protective devices supplied to workers.

Just how the mere announcement by Mr. Kerr, the then minister, put Ontario ahead of other provinces is beyond my comprehension. But my reason for mentioning the article at all is to point out that after more than two years Ontario still has no noise control legislation, except for some vague regulations under the Industrial Safety Act, which set no decibel levels at all.

On April 15, 1972, about a month ago, the Minister of the Environment for Ontario (Mr. Auld) announced that the University of Western Ontario had been awarded $45,000 to study noise levels in London and Woodstock. The study would include the drafting by the law faculty of an enforceable bylaw, presumably for the cities of London and Woodstock. Inasmuch as the study is expected to take 14 months, I shall hazard a prediction that 1973 will come and go with Ontario citizens still without protection from the ever-increasing levels of noise.

In discussing Bill 59 today, I wish to borrow two or three paragraphs from an editorial in the Ottawa Journal of July 4, 1970. The editorial began:

> UNWANTED SOUND: THE PERVASIVE ENEMY
>
> In 1907, a renowned bacteriologist, Dr. Robert Koch, warned: "The day will come when man will have to fight merciless noise as the worst enemy of his health."
>
> Many will argue that Koch's prophecy has come true in the Seventies. The cacophony of modern life is a daily reminder that excessive noise is certainly, if not our "worst enemy," at least a feared and formidable foe.

The rather lengthy editorial concluded with these words:

> Though city dwellers in particular, and in increasing numbers their governments, are becoming aware of the dangers of noise, the fight for more silence is slow, and all too often ineffective. Ottawa is a typical example, with an anti-noise bylaw passed last September [1969], amended in February [1970], and still just a piece of paper because the meters needed to enforce it are still not available [in July, 1970]. Noise is defined as unwanted sound. To which we add unhealthy, unnecessary and—sadly—too often unchallenged.

Bill 59, Mr. Speaker, at least challenges the government to make an immediate start in protecting the people of Ontario from unnecessary, unhealthy and noisome noise.

One aspect of this dilatoriness on the part of the Ontario government that I find particularly frustrating is that noise consultants are likely to have a field day doing extensive studies for various municipalities. Toronto a year ago launched a $325,000 study to take 20 months, 12 months being devoted to monitoring and evaluating noise, four months to be spent on "predicting the sound level expected from development projects;" and another four months drawing up suggestions for anti-noise measures and drafting a revised anti-noise bylaw for the city of Toronto.

Just imagine, $325,000 for a niose study for Toronto. At least the study by the University of Western Ontario of noise in London and Woodstock is to cost only $45,000. Meanwhile, last summer, Kitchener-Waterloo Probe, aided by support and advice from the faculty members of the engineering department, carried out an Opportunities for Youth federal programme. This study was completed on a volunteer basis in the fall. The total cost was about $5,000. Had all the donated time and expertise been paid for, the cost would have been probably no more than $10,000.

In return for this modest investment a substantial report was achieved, including the first known computer printout of an outdoor noise contour map of a city, which I have here and draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker.

It is based on a procedure devised at Harvard and represents 24-hour average noise levels for the month of August, 1971. It shows at a glance where noise is intruding into the residential areas. As a result, planners will be able to use the noise level as another criterion in determining zones for industrial, commercial and residential areas and for urban renewal.

The worst noise-polluted area, in size, in the whole of Waterloo, has been the north end of the city along Highway 85. The cause of the noise is traffic leaving and entering the Conestoga Parkway. This area, now planned as a residential section, is obviously unsuitable for that purpose unless traffic engineers find a solution for the noise problem. Perhaps a different road surface and the planting of trees or shubbery could help to make this area comfortably inhabitable in the years to come.

Inasmuch as it is generally anticipated that noise levels will continue to increase, it is urgent that planners know what the noise pattern is. Only in this way can they hope to avoid serious errors in the future. Similar useful studies in other cities could be made inexpensively by students in summertime projects. I commend this study, the Kitchener-Waterloo Probe study, and its duplication to the Minister of the Environment.

Because individuals differ in their tolerance of noise, it has been difficult to decide upon acceptable levels. Everyone finds daytime noise easier to tolerate than noise made at night. Noise is easier for healthy individuals to endure than it is for those who are ill. It is also easier for persons who are making or sponsoring noise to tolerate it than it is for those who regard themselves as victims of noise pollution. Nevertheless, consensus seems to have been achieved whereby the 85-decibel level is regarded as the point where health hazards begin.

By this standard, power lawnmowers, registering as they do between 65 and 80 decibels, seem to be safe even for the operator, unless he is occupied full-time in mowing lawns.

On the other hand, most snowmobile operators are exposed to from 100 to 125 decibels when driving their machine. In other words, according to some experts, two hours at 100 decibels is a maximum safe period. At 115 decibels, 15 minutes in a snowmobile might be too long an exposure. The National Research Council recommends the wearing of earplugs for anyone driving a snowmobile for more than 10 minutes.

At 125 decibels, temporary deafness results from even short exposure; and substantial permanent hearing loss can result from moderate exposure at this level.

One hour of what might be called mild rock music at 105 decibels, is the maximum tolerable, according to the present consensus. Above 115 decibels, of course, there is no guarantee of safety. Jet planes on the runway create 150 decibels; a volume no one should view with equanimity, because eardrums have been known to rupture at 160 decibels.

I am sure that no member of this Legislature will be surprised to hear that hard rock music is rated high on the list of noise polluters. One rock musician gave it up after three years when he noticed that his ears were buzzing with increasing frequency after an evening's performance. In explanation, he said: "You are always hearing about someone who comes off the stage one night and his hearing is just gone. That is one of the reasons I gave it up."

This hearsay evidence is supported by scientists, who report that the upper level of tolerance for eight hours of continual noise is 90 decibels. At 100 decibels the allowed time is only two hours. At 105 decibels, one hour is a safe time. At 115 decibels, 15 minutes is the maximum time deemed safe.

As a matter of fact Mr. Tom Cummings of our own environmental safety branch, has been quoted as declaring that a level of 115 decibels or more is unsafe, "for 15 minutes or 15 seconds." About 120 decibels is regarded as the threshold of pain. At about 130, instant and permanent deafness may occur. Yet, the range of decibels in tests

conducted at rock band dances it from 105 to 125, with occasional levels of 135.

Professor John E. K. Foreman, a noise specialist at the University of Western Ontario, says: "These kids, and especially the rock musicians themselves, run a very serious risk of permanent hearing loss by the time they reach their 40s if they continue to be exposed to two hours a day of this level."

Section 14(i) of this Bill 59 would permit the Lieutenant Governor in Council to prescribe the noise criteria to be used in controlling, regulating or prohibiting the emission of any noise, including rock bands.

The most serious noise threat is in industry, of course, where sawmills, steel plants and construction equipment are in constant operation. Hearing loss is usually so gradual that it is not noticed until it has become permanent. The Ontario Department of Health is responsible for enforcing section 32 of the province's Industrial Safety Act, which requires employers to reduce or eliminate noise from machines in order to prevent injury to the hearing of employees.

Professor Don Keeler of the electrical engineering department of the University of Waterloo has criticized the vagueness of Ontario's statute and the lack of regulations. Certainly the number of loss of hearing claims received by the Workmen's Compensation Board is increasing rapidly. In 1956 there were only 14 such claims, but by 1968 there were 177 cases of hearing loss resulting from industrial noise.

According to insurance experts, one out of every five workers in the United States is slowly going deaf because of noise in his place of work, shop, office or factory. Truck drivers and rock musicans are among the most vulnerable. Think of it: 20 per cent of the American work force slowly going deaf!

A recent California study revealed that out of 26 different construction equipment units tested, 25 had noise levels above human tolerance. Our own Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) has told of a test that included 55 farm tractors and 18 other pieces of farm equipment; not one was below the 85-decibel level, the threshold of hearing hazard.

A Saskatchewan Health Department study showed that farmers had greater loss of hearing than the general public. The loss increased with the amount of time spent on tractors. Among the older farmers cultivating two or more sections of land, 60 per cent had trouble understanding normal speech because of their impaired hearing.

At the 1969 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, doctors reported various experiments showing that noise causes stress and tension and occasionally intolerable nervous strain; that noise makes people irritable, unsociable and quarrelsome; that noise can cause seizures in epileptics; that even unborn children can be disturbed by noise, possibly with harmful results.

Other investigators claim that excess noise contributes to heart attacks, high blood pressures, ulcers and even sexual impotency. Impaired vision and loss of balance have been attributed to excessive noise also.

The National Research Council at Ottawa recommends three general principles or guidelines for legislation to control noise:

1. The actual noise produced should be the criterion of violation, not the noise capability of the machine or the vehicle.

2. Zoning areas, commercial, residential and industrial, should be adopted as a foundation for setting noise limits.

3. The long-term aim should be to reduce noise pollution, not merely to hold the line.

One reason for the past apathy toward the loss of hearing is the belief that old age is the cause of deafness, or that deafness is a result of old age. According to an article in Saturday Review of May 27, 1967, this theory has been challenged. A study of a tribe in Sudan shows that 90-year-olds and 10-year-olds have exactly the same blood pressure levels. In Americans, considered normally healthy, blood pressure levels usually increase progressively with age, especially after 40.

The elders of this tribe, located in one of the world's few quiet zones, suffered very little hearing loss with advancing age. The hearing of the elderly members of this Sudanese tribe was found to be far superior to that of older people in the so-called civilized countries. The tribe had hearing superior to that of any other group of humans ever tested.

There is evidence, therefore, that it is not normal to lose one's hearing nor to gain in blood pressure with advancing age. Much of the price we pay for civilization is exacted by the numerous noises man has invented. Incidentally, even a kitchen can produce noise levels up to 95 decibels if it has the usual quota of modern gadgets.

Only a government, Mr. Speaker, can protect the public and how much longer, we ask, must we wait for this government to act?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this debate, because there is just no question that there is growing concern with respect to noise pollution; so I am pleased to have a chance to speak. I commend the member for Sandwich-Riverside in bringing forward this bill, which is another effort to point up the problem.

I'm particularly interested in the problem of traffic control from the standpoint of the noise on superhighways. From time to time I receive correspondence or calls from people who live along the Queen E, or in proximity to it. Living similarly myself, I appreciate and have sympathy with the validity of their complaints. The hon. member did mention something about there being no reference to control other than the Industrial Standards Act, if I heard correctly. The Environmental Protection Act of last year has a section that refers to noise and it got some prominence then.

In May, 1969, the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Braithwaite) brought in a resolution, and when I saw this bill being introduced it twigged. I went back to that and I think the reason for it, or what it brought it on, was that at the time these was a proposal to expand Malton airport. The matter of noise and decibels had a real good discussion and going over, and I noted with interest the decibel count references made by the member.

As he said, sound is measured in decibels. At 70 only really sleepy people can sleep. At 80 there is a difference, communication by speech becomes impossible. Between 90 and 100 earmuffs are in order; and at 120 there is physical frustration and mental confusion. At 140 you could experience difficulty or pain; and at 160 you may rupture eardrums.

At the time of that debate I had the opportunity to participate and made reference to an article in the Contemporary Review of September, 1967. It is still, I think, pretty valid reference material for anyone who is interested in pursuing the subject and perhaps the hon. member did make use of that.

Reference was made to rock music. In that article it said there was a steady beat of 110 near the loudspeakers at a New Year Eve's party and 20 or 30 young people were dazed into immobility because of these self-inflicted noises. When you have an opportunity not to be subject to them, I don't know why people would enjoy such ear-splitting circumstances.

Anyway, the bills calls for research in the field of noise pollution. Metro, as well as the province, is so engaged, and there has been some interest and some work done in this area. Metro, I believe, is taking levels, along the Don Valley Parkway for one place and probably elsewhere.

Last year the province established a noise barrier, just east of Highway 27, on the south side of Highway 401. Anyone going by can see it. It is not a very long distance, but it cost a quarter of a million dollars. They have taken counts since, and I understand there will be an announcement quite soon now. So it will be interesting to know just how beneficial this effort has been.

Locally, the county of Peel put through the Queensway West, and there was an outcry from residents because they were concerned of the noise that would result from this extension, which is a four-lane highway with a 40-mile speed limit. They put up a 10-foot concrete wall—maybe 10 inches in width—for about half a mile. The cost was something like $100,000. The people who live adjacent to it—their backyards abut the wall—claim it has been very beneficial.

The only problem is that diesel transports going along emit exhaust just at the level of the top of the wall, or a bit above it; so that is still a bother. I think by decibel count it is perhaps psychological because there was no road there before. Nevertheless, they say that they just hear the hum of a car, and possibly the speed limit of 40 miles an hour has something to do with it too.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications wrote to one of my constituents last year and mentioned a couple of studies that are under way at this time. The principal one is on point-source emissions. Steps have been taken in this regard with legislation that has been passed in the US. This gives legislative authority the power to lay down certain standards on decibel levels beyond which new cars, buses or other vehicles will not be permitted to operate. And the other one, he wrote, is the matter of sound barriers.

So some of the controls mentioned in this bill are receiving attention. I am told that heavy traffic on the 401 and the Queen E give a top decibel reading of about 75. This, of course, is above comfortable human tolerance.

In a letter early last year the then Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) wrote:

> With respect to the regulations that control motor vehicle equipment. There is such equipment and municipalities can apply and prosecute—and have—as can the province. There were some 18,000 convictions in 1969.

Well, Mr. Speaker, an overall approach is needed.

I will just conclude; I see the time is running out.

The manufacture of vehicles is under control of the federal government. To have approved equipment placed on vehicles now may be a bit unrealistic, if we can expect replacement parts to be better than the original. But certainly the new equipment should have more efficient devices.

The other thing I think needs some attention is the control of land use. Etobicoke put in showcase industry along the Queen E. So there are no complaints there, I wouldn't think, from residents; because there aren't any residents. I think proper land use is one of the approaches we should give more emphasis to.

I think having the travel parts of a highway at a lower level is a good thing, too. They changed Highway 10 and the Queen E, where they put the Queen E over 10. Prior to that it was under Highway 10. When they raised the Queen E up, just from my own knowledge, without having any decibel counter, the vibrations of noise increased tremendously.

So it's in some of these areas that work can be done. I would join in endorsing the principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Bill 59, the Noise Pollution Control Act, 1972.

I am pleased to see some of the interest taken by members of this House to debate an issue that is important to the community and to the family life in Ontario. The member for Sandwich-Riverside, who has initiated this bill, must be congratulated for his effort and concern for so many citizens who want some form of protection in Ontario.

The ultimate solution to our noise pollution, as with many other problems of society, is protecion. Unfortunately, the progress and form of protection are law and government legislation. I can recall last July 27, the Davis government placed a bill before the House called the Environmental Protection Act, Bill 94, for second reading. It was debated into the early hours. I think it was sometime around 4:25 in the morning that we adjourned that debate. The intent of the bill was to reduce air pollution in Ontario and air pollution covers quite an area.

I know at that time I had moved an amendment to the bill. I said then that there was nothing mentioned in the bill about the word "noise", and I had moved an amendment that a noise management branch be established. I believe the minister at that time said there was no need for it and that air pollution control in the Province of Ontario would take this in.

Today I just received this little brochure again and it's from the Ministry of Environment entitled: "Introducing Environment in Ontario." It goes on to say:

> "Our purpose is to serve you. We are responsible for providing a clean and healthy environment in Ontario, and controlling pollution of land, air and water."

When one looks at the structure of the ministry, we can come under the executive director of the air and land pollution control division.

The brochure refers to the director of the air quality branch, the director of waste management branch and the chief of pesticide control services; but there is nothing in here that covers the word "noise"—not one mention of it.

Yet I can recall, last September I believe it was, when the big election campaign was on, and out flew all the Tory ads and the Tory pamphlets saying it is a great thing that we have this environmental bill in the Province of Ontario, and perhaps it is far more than any other province has offered to the people; this is one of the best bills to protect the people from noise.

But when you look at it, it is not so. One can say, what a great disappointment for many citizens. Until this day, the government has not had the guts or the courage to bring in regulations enforcing its own Act.

I can recall some of the letters I have written to the department requesting some assistance on matters dealing with noise pollution. The advice that I received from the deputy minister was that the regulations would be in by last December. Until this day, there is no regulation controlling noise.

Mr. Kennedy: They're working on it.

Mr. Haggerty: They're still working on it.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): In the fullness of time, it'll come!

Mr. Haggerty: In the fullness of time!

I mentioned one particular problem in my area where a new industry had established. It deals with a drop forge, and you know, this creates quite a nuisance. The people there never had to be subject to such a noise. We keep getting promises, promises that something is going to be done; but apparently not. I know there is a petition before the government requesting assistance, but sometimes it's useless.

Sometimes we can blame it on the legislators here, and I think I'd have to say that much of the fault lies right in this assembly.

Even though there is an increase in technology, we find an increase in the noise level throughout the Province of Ontario. We don't seem to be able to keep up with the technological change which creates further noise. When we look at this new airport coming into the Province of Ontario, I am sure that the people resident in that area are going to be subject to noise they never heard before, perhaps of these big jumbo jets. Yet we have no regulations to control it. And I know it creates quite a problem with the—

Mr. Kennedy: That's federal.

Mr. Haggerty: Oh, that's federal. Yes, we hear often in this House—that's federal. But surely we have some authority here in this province to provide protection to people and give them that protection they want.

An hon. member: Sure, we do.

Mr. Haggerty: Motor vehicles have been mentioned in the bill. In fact they create the most pervasive noise in our civilization. We can also talk about motorcycles. I am sure the decibel levels from motorcycles alone are, I believe, unbearable. I happen to live in one of the quiet communities in the Province of Ontario and I can tell you when there is a group of motorcycle riders in the area, as they come down the roads heading for the surf and beaches I tell you it pretty near drives you right out of the house. It is so bad at night you don't know where to head for. And yet, you know, we say it is under federal regulations.

I can tell you this, if you are out on the highway driving a car with the muffler off it doesn't take too long before a police officer is there and a charge is laid. Surely we can come in with some regulation to provide a reasonable decibel level acceptable to all.

Just yesterday, I was out cutting down some diseased elm trees, and I was using a little power chain saw. I can tell you that this creates quite a noise—I can hear the buzzing noise right now—and you can hear this for miles around.

We hear so much about the snowmobile and the noise it is going to create in the Province of Ontario—yet no one says anything about the chain saws which are being used day after day, year after year, in our Ontario forests. You know it creates quite a problem—perhaps with the deer cycle.

The hon. member mentioned something about noise pollution in industry. Perhaps I can cover some ground on that. I have the current release from the Workmen's Compensation Board which, under industrial noise deafness claims, 1971, says that out of 370 claims reported, 248 claims were accepted for either medical reasons or permanent disability. Out of those 248 accepted claims, 130 were pensioned off for life because of noise.

I can tell you something about the noise in industry. I have used the large riveting guns around the tank—particularly in that area you can't stand it—the noise is unbearable. Fifteen or 20 years ago, I think, we used to have to put cotton into our ears and that used to reduce the noise a little bit.

But today we have hearing protectors which, I think are rather clumsy at times. You can't communicate with one another; you can't communicate with workers and so forth. I even find this with youngsters in large safety helmets driving motor-cycles today. The helmets are providing protection to the head, but the youngsters cannot hear anything that is coming behind them, even if the motorcycle is shut down. Some of these things used to protect the people are a nuisance too.

I think today noise deafness is a major category in industrial injury and is costly in compensation claims. If we could go back 10 years it could run into perhaps $1 million.

Noise is an invasion of our living space, and research in the United States and other countries has shown that noise affects more than the ears; it can affect other parts of the human body, particularly the cardiovascular system, thus creating additional health problems. As has been mentioned before the decibel level should be about 85.

Some persons can tolerate 85, some can tolerate more and some less.

Noise affects all of us and there are psychological effects. For example, noise can startle, annoy and disrupt concentration and sleep; it even disrupts relaxation, interferes with communications and speech and in consequence interferes with job performance and safety.

I have talked about this matter before. I think the important thing Mr. Speaker, is that the people in the Province of Ontario should have some legal rights for protection. This protection is long overdue and I would like to see the government move as quickly as possible to bring in regulations to give that protection on noise pollution. It's not too much of a problem, I think, to bring this in. I think the citizens of Ontario want action now to reduce noise, before the problem becomes further activated.

I concur with this bill and I am sure that this party does also.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Yes, I shall speak rapidly Mr. Speaker. I want to commend, applaud, salute, extol the virtues of the member for Sandwich-Riverside who has introduced this Noise Pollution Control Act. He has been for some considerable years in this Legislature, and is now, a man more informed than most of us about matters of environmental control in the province. This Act is yet a further extension of the knowledge which he brings, and the appropriateness of applying that knowledge to real situations. It is not a long Act, but it is an Act which in its reading is sensible and relevant, and let me say to the member for Peel South, should have been part of the government's Environmental Protection Act. The reason that the member for Sandwich-Riverside brings this Act before the Legislature today is that despite what the member for Peel South on the government side said, there is not a single reference to this subject in the Environmental Protection Act of 1971.

I will qualify that. Certainly there is not one that the member for Welland South or I have been able to find, and the amendment about the noise control officer was not accepted by the government. There was reference made to it all being covered by the Air Pollution Control Act, yet the Environmental Protection Act, section 94, subsection (k), under Regulations, says that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations amending or revoking in whole or in part the regulations made under the Air Pollution Control Act, 1967. But from that date to this, as has been pointed out, there is not a single regulation governing questions of noise pollution in the Province of Ontario. It is one of the singular abdications of political responsibility on the part of this government that in areas of noise as in areas of waste management, we are still awaiting the appropriate regulations.

What makes it a real political abdication is that the information is available. It is information which the member for Peel South has put on the record himself more than once; it is information which the New Democratic Party has put on the record more than once; it is information which the official opposition has brought to the attention of the House more than once. There is no conceivable excuse for not embodying the available data, scientific knowledge and information in legislative proposals and regulations implementing those proposals. What it is about the government that makes it refuse to operate in the area of noise pollution control is something that to this day remains a mystery.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): They are paying compensation claims on it.

Mr. Lewis: It is perhaps the most extraordinary case of bureaucratic inertia in that department, but it is a very serious one.

Now, the gap between—

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): —makes the most noise.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I don't like to turn private members' hours into a political matter. The member for Prince Edward-Lennox would like us all to have a little tri-partisan orgy, Mr. Speaker, where we indulge each other in happy homilies and friendly comment. I'm not so inclined. I consider the absence of noise pollution control legislation to be the responsibility of this government. That is why this Act is now before us.

Mr. Speaker, as every member of the House knows, it is a problem that impresses itself in a variety of ways on all kinds of people in the province. Rather more dramatically and consistently now than heretofore.

I was really interested when my colleague, the member for Sandwich-Riverside, revealed the map brought together by Pollution Probe in Waterloo to show the noise pattern. I suppose one could have predicted that on

Highway 85 on the Conestoga Parkway that the noise levels would be incompatible with residential development. But that won't stop the residential development from occurring just as it occurs all over the province.

There is one matter that verges on the criminal. Certainly it is inexcusable, that we should in this province be paying out money for 250 compensation claims in any given year in industry for damage—health damage, medical damage—by virtue of noise.

It may not be possible to control accidents, Mr. Speaker, but it is possible to introduce constraints that maintain noise levels at a degree which is compatible with human labour. It is absurd, it is a folly, that we should still be paying compensation and permanent disability pensions under the Workmen's Compensation Act for injuiries caused to hearing by virtue of noise. We know that is one area where we can apply regulations which bring it under control. I cannot imagine the willingness to persist in this endless game of forever revising the regulations while there are such unhappy consequences to individuals and groups around the province.

Before I make way for the historic entry of the member for Muskoka (Mr. Miller), I want to make reference to my own riding in Scarborough West. I have had matters of noise pollution brought to my attention on at least two recent occasions, and it has impressed itself deeply on me in terms of what average citizens in the province put up with in the absence of any legislation and regulations.

I have a plant in my riding, Pilkington Glass, which I dealt with concerning other environmental control matters in the estimates of the Ministry of the Environment. Trains shunting back and forth in the yard of the plant carrying powdered glass and glass chips cause an enormous assault on the hearing sensibilities of residents in the immediate neighbourhood. To this day this has not been solved because there are no regulations to govern that.

In another part of my riding subway cars pass right next door to a residential setting, as an extension of the Toronto Transit Commission subway running up through to Warden Ave. in Scarborough.

I had a visit at my constituency clinic a few weeks ago from one Mr. Gerald Zalkovich of 36 Albion Ave. in Scarborough. I want to put his name on the record because he is one of those citizens one meets from time to time—a rare breed—who technically persists in seeing that an obvious injustice is one day overcome.

Here is a man who, in conjunction with a number of area residents, has been signing petitions—I have them in front of me—trying to make the case before the Toronto Transit Commission and the Scarborough Council that the levels of noise are intolerable. The citizens feel that in the long run it will clearly be a damage to human health and they are absolutely mystified as to why it is that noise levels cannot be contained by some legislative means.

They go to the Scarborough Council and the council expresses concern and solidarity with their problem. They point out that there is a borough of Scarborough bylaw. It has kind of a quaint title, it is a bylaw to prohibit the ringing of bells, the blowing of horns, shouting unusual noises and noises likely to disturb inhabitants of the municipality.

We are very archaic in our expressions in Scarborough, Mr. Speaker.

But let me tell you within that general umbrella there lies the screeching noise created by Toronto Transit Commission subway cars and it is is spelled out that such noise is clearly beyond the bylaw, except for a clause at the end which says "None of the provisions of this bylaw shall apply to any case of public convenience or necessity." Thus, gone is the argument for the people who would wish to make it.

So they write to the Toronto Transit Commission and—I have always felt this interesting in the corporate world—they always hear back from the director of public relations. Not the director of noise control; or the head of the commission, or the secretary of the commission, or the vice-president of the commission; but the director of public relations.

He and I have exchanged a little correspondence, which alas, being pressured on the flanks as I am, I do not have time to put on the record, valuable though it may be. But the effect of the correspondence, Mr. Speaker, is to show that although the Toronto Transit Commission is apparently endeavouring to test the noise levels, to test the decibel level, to try to do something about the railway joints, or the tracks, or whatever else is involved; to this day it has not been solved. Months has passed, in fact years have now passed; and one of the inhibiting features is the absence of any regulatory legislation from this government.

Surely this bill fills that gap—unless the Tory party is savagely split between the hon.

member for Peel South and the hon. member for Muskoka; which I doubt, I cannot imagine that occurring—all of us in this House would support the Noise Pollution Control Act. The genial member, the House leader, is in the House. I have no doubt at the end of the debate he would wish us to take a vote—his Whip has come in to mount the forces—and to show how members of all parties are firmly behind this piece of appropriate legislation. And now, Mr. Speaker, with bated breath, I wait the next speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Muskoka.

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, the member for Scarborough West was waiting my historic arrival on the scene, but as fifth speaker in this, I should say it is more hysteric, because at this present time I discover all that I had to say has been said so adequately by those who precede me.

The thing I would like to say, of course, is that I, too, have to agree with the principle of Bill 59. There seems to be some argument as to whether noise, in fact, is a pollutant. Some experts say it is not; but that is because, of course, it has no residual effect upon the environment after its creation. However, it is a nuisance. It is an irritant and it is a contaminant.

Now for this reason I would point out that the bill that was passed last year, the Environmental Protection Act, really covers a great deal of the material that is covered by the proposed bill today. It did lack regulation, and I would like to talk about that at this point. I am quite sure that this bill also requires regulation before in effect it will do anything to solve the problems of noise on our environment.

Now, in dealing with the Environmental Protection Act, I believe it was said there was no mention of noise, but there is. Under sub-section (c) of section 1, it says, "sound and vibration shall be classified as a contaminant"; and of course sound is noise, if I have read it properly. So I do agree with your principle. I simply say we have the framework already on the books and let us then see what is wrong or what needs to be done to make this law effective.

I would say, for example, in the existing Act we already have some of the things the member wants. We have a noise pollution control advisory board, and I believe that is something similar to the board the member suggested in his Act.

He suggested a board for— pardon me, we have an environmental council whereas he wants a noise pollution control advisory board; I believe they perform the same basic purpose. The terms of the environmental council are a little wider because they deal with all contaminants, not just with noise. I believe there are 11 men on it rather than 12, as he suggested for his committee.

We also have a pollution control appeal board legislated; and again the member suggested an appeal procedure be set up for people who wished to contest the regulations that were imposed upon them.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Whatever happened to the environmental council?

Mr. Miller: I don't know what happened to it. I can only talk about what should happen. I wasn't here last year.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Miller: I don't think it takes guts, as the member for Welland South said, to make the regulations. It takes facts. And that is where the problem lies—because we can't agree upon the intensity of soumd that in fact bothers people.

The member has used the term 85 decibels, and that is pretty generally agreed upon as the highest noise level to which one should be subjected. I believe they say that if anyone works in an 85-DBA environment for eight hours a day, five days a week, for five years, he finally has lost a good part of his hearing, and it degrades from there on.

But not all noise has the same total effect. You can put a measuring device out in the air and get an 85 decibel reading that bothers your ears and at another time an 85 decibel reading that doesn't bother your ears. This is because the other factor in sound measurement is frequency as well as intensity, and this is one of the stumbling blocks.

Let us take the Etobicoke bylaw for example. Etobicoke has a bylaw covering noises that fall into the nuisance category—the things that go bump in the night—that the member for Scarborough West says they have in Scarborough. It says for example that the noise from an air conditioner must not exceed 60 DBA at the edge of one's property. One can imagine an inspector running around with a machine to measure 60 DBA, putting it down and having highway trucks going by the door registering 85. It is when you get to a court of law that many of the present proposed regulations fall down.

I think Milwaukee just had to scrap its bylaws. I think members will find that Quebec is having trouble with its bylaws. I believe the only city that is having any success in implementing regulations that seem to have effect is Chicago. I believe a number of people are studying recently imposed regulations in the city of Chicago, including those of us in Ontario.

I would think also that the Ministry of the Environment, not the Ministry of Health, is the one that should continue to police noise problems.

So there are in fact many factors to consider. I understand at the present time there is a joint committee of the Ministries of Health, Environment, Transportation and Communications, as well as Treasury and Intergovernmental Affairs, all working together to correlate the work of the Woodstock study, the London study, the Toronto study, to get our problems into regulatable form.

I would like to think that within a short time, with the efforts of these kinds of people, we will have regulations that can be applied.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I too rise to support this bill and congratulate the member for Sandwich-Riverside for bringing it in.

At the last session my colleague from Etobicoke brought in a bill relating to noise pollution but it wasn't nearly as broad in scope as this. It certainly is one that we should be pushing and pressing the government to take action on as soon as possible.

In New York City I was interested to find that "Citizens For a Quieter City" has formed quite a political wing under the leadership of Robert Barron, who resigned his previous job as a play producer or director. It has been concentrating on trying to eliminate some of the causes of noise in New York City. These result in the decibel rating during rush hour being 95 at street level, which is a pretty shattering experience to go through.

He cites a situation that brought things to a head as far as he was concerned, having several air compressors and jack hammers working for months on end on a street corner opposite him. He read a story about a young lad having been shot to death in nearby Bronx. For the man who did the shooting, when this young lad and his friends were playing and shouting and having a good time, it was just the straw that broke the camel's back. He had been so upset by noise that he was becoming deranged.

Certainly the problem is one of enforcement. I think, though, there is also a problem of leadership. I suggest that this government, if it is not in a position yet to introduce legislation, could at least start by insisting that any government contracts such as the vehicles they buy, the contracts they lease, contain provision for noise control. It is possible to have muffled jack hammers and air compressors at a cost of not more than 10 per cent above the unmuffled ones, and if we practice what we preach here, perhaps industry will follow suit.

Mr. Speaker: This completes the private members' hour.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, due to the problems we are having with the committees outside of the House, I would like to move that notwithstanding a previous order that the estimates of the Ministry of Education be considered in the committee of supply.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. S. Lewis: (Scarborough West): What is that?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): By the estimates committee?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am simply moving them back here into the House. We are having difficulty scheduling them.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is to move the consideration of the estimates of the Ministry of Education back to the House rather than committee.

Mr. Lewis: They will follow Health?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I think that is correct.

Mr. Lewis: In the House?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): What comes next in committee then?

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In order to be fair to the hon. members, I would say that the Ministry of Education will be heard in the House following the Ministry of Health.

Mr. Stokes: Is that in committee?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Pardon?

Mr. Lewis: What happens in committee then?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In the committee outside of the House, at the present time the Ministry of Colleges and Universities is being heard. The next one that I had called was the Ministry of Community and Social Services. I am going to ask later this evening that the routine be changed so that the Management Board estimates be heard because the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. MacNaughton) must represent the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) at a meeting in Europe. I will call his at that time.

Mr. Martel: That has got to be mental gymnastics.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would like now to call item No. 27.

Clerk of the House: 27th order, House in committee; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

It being 6 o'clock p.m. the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Task force on litter, statement by Mr. Auld 2681

Control of pesticides, statement by Mr. Auld 2682

Task force on litter, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Foulds 2683

Landfill in Kempenfelt Bay, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2683

Petawawa bridge damage, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Good 2683

University tuition fees, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2684

Auto workers lay-off threat, questions of Mr. Guindon and Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 2685

Bell Canada rates, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Lewis 2685

Inquiry regarding discontinued rail lines, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Lewis 2686

Forgivable loan obligations, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 2686

Windsor packers, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Bounsall 2686

Metro Toronto incinerator, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Deacon 2687

Sale of children's home property in Hamilton, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Deans 2687

Police reaction to inquest, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Singer 2687

Periodic medical checkups, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Gisborn 2688

French version of Ontario theme song, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Roy 2689

Sale of firecrackers, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans 2689

Highway 404 construction, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Deacon 2690

Ontario Place liquor licences, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Shulman 2690

Weekend parking for public at Labour Department lots, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Givens 2690

Pollution control at Barrys Bay, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Burr 2691

Re-testing of accident-prone drivers, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Roy 2691

Task force on litter, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Germa 2691

Support of cultural nationalism, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lawlor 2691

Presenting annual report, Department of Highways, Mr. Carton 2694

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 2694

Estimates, Ministry of Health, Mr. Potter, continued 2694

Private members' hour 2717

Noise pollution, bill to control, on second reading, Mr. Burr, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Miller, Mr. Deacon 2717

Recess, 6 o'clock 2727

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 69

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HEALTH
(*concluded*)

On vote 2304:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Well, Mr. Minister, I will just finish off very quickly. We will forget the past 13 years. As the minister said, it's a new ball game. We will forget the past 13 years. We will move to a new era in the Sudbury area with the planning council that's going to resolve hopefully all the problems. One year from now though, Mr. Minister, we will be back.

I might ask the minister at this stage, too, if he would consider—and he is a bit of a radical himself—entering into some dialogue with the members from that area with respect to people who might serve on that planning council. Rather than the traditional sources of information, he might just consult the three members—they are all New Democrats from that area—on people who might serve on the area planning council he envisages.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I am shocked to think that the hon. member would suggest we would make political appointments.

Mr. Martel: I didn't say that.

Mr. D. J. Wiseman (Lanark): That is the way it sounded.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I worded that as nicely as I could so that it wouldn't sound that way.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): You made the point.

Mr. Martel: But you got the message.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2304 carried?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask—

Mr. Chairman: On 2304?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, 2304. The minister is aware of the problem back in the city of Windsor concerning the need for facilities for the younger folk and the fact that the Rotary Club has gone all out in an attempt to provide the facilities. I just wanted to ask the minister if his department is programming the development of the facility that the Rotary Club has in mind—one that will encompass all of the children in the community. I understand it is a facility to accommodate some 200 young children.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Retarded or emotionally disturbed, which one is this you are talking about?

Mr. B. Newman: 2304.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, but—

Mr. B. Newman: Specifically retardation and so forth.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Pardon?

Mr. B. Newman: I am referring specifically to retardation and so forth; the whole programme that would involve.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, that has been taken into consideration.

Mr. B. Newman: Could the minister enlarge upon his comment? When does he plan on, or when can he foresee the programme actually in effect? When can he foresee financial assistance from the province to the Rotary Club?

Hon. Mr. Potter: At the present time the director of this programme is looking at property down there. By the end of this year we should have a diagnostic centre in operation and then we are also planning a facility there for the mentally retarded.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I happen to have a news clip of April 19 of this year in which a centre for mentally retarded was mentioned. A Dr. Douglas Kavelman, chairman of the residential care committee of the Ontario Association for Mentally

Retarded told a Windsor audience that the Ontario Association for Mentally Retarded has prepared a report following the 1971 decision of the Ontario government to revamp the system of caring for the mentally retarded. Now, under that, there is the proposition that a regional centre for Windsor would be established, priority being given to a unit in the Sault Ste. Marie area. Could the minister elaborate? When can he foresee that being set up?

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is not much to elaborate, except as I have said we are in the process of now trying to negotiate for the property and as soon as we get it we will have it in operation. It's on the way.

Mr. B. Newman: I am sorry, Mr. Minister, I didn't hear your first comments.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2304 carried?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister what is the present state of per diem costs in the various children's centres and in some of the OHs?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They vary, actually. The per diem at Smiths Falls, one of the lowest, is $18.08 for 1971-1972. In Aurora it is $21.39, Cedar Springs is $18.36, Cobourg is $21.91, Picton is $35.55, Palmerston is $27.42. Hospitals vary. The lowest is North Bay at $19.89 and the highest is $49.96 at London, and the others are in between: Woodstock is $25.45, Whitby, $29.57. I've got them here if you would like to have a copy.

Mr. Lewis: What accounts for the $19.89 at North Bay? Does that mean that it's serving both retardation and active treatment?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Some of it is due to the fact that we haven't got as much staff there as we would like to have in the way of senior psychiatrists and social workers, such as we would have in some of the others down in the London area, in teaching centres, where we have a higher percentage of staff, which is much better. It's more research oriented, too. We are having trouble, as I said earlier here today, in trying to get enough psychiatrists to man most of our hospitals. But those in the northern part of the province are just that much more difficult and, of course, that is reflected in the per diem rates.

Mr. Lewis: I can certainly appreciate that, Mr. Minister, although I am hard pressed to imagine how one can, in this day and age, do decent, acute treatment at $19.89 a day even in an OH. God knows there are better settings, but even in an OH, that's pretty low.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You see, in a place like London, in the teaching centre, you have a big outpatient service, too. You have relatively no patient service in a place like North Bay—no outpatient service, or at least there are a lot fewer patients. There are very few patients, I would say, at North Bay, compared to what you would have at London as far as outpatients are concerned.

Mr. Lewis: Why should outpatients increase the per diem cost?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They increase your cost because you are increasing your staff and services.

Mr. Lewis: But a large and flourishing OPD would surely bring per diem costs down for an Ontario Hospital, I would have thought, rather than increasing it.

Tell us something about the staff problems at some of the OHs, Mr. Minister. What is the situation at North Bay? How many senior positions are open and what is the state of some of the others, say Brockville in eastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Thunder Bay?

Mr. Lewis: Thunder Bay, yes.

Hon. Mr. Potter: As of today I think we have got one psychiatrist.

Mr. Martel: You need a medical school in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We need a psychiatrist school in northern Ontario.

Mr. Martel: A medical school would open it up.

Hon. Mr. Potter: North Bay, what have we got there?

Mr. Martel: Not Waterloo—next one, Sudbury.

Mr. Stokes: Four-fifths of the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There are two psychiatrists short in North Bay.

Mr. Lewis: Out of a complement of how many?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Have to get it for you.

Mr. Lewis: Okay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): And you have one in all of northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to wait for the answer but I—

Hon. Mr. Potter: We are trying to get psychiatrists all over the place.

Mr. Lewis: No, but I'd like to wait for the answer if it is available. I'd like to know the intended complements of supervisory staff in the psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker area, and the actual complement for half a dozen of your OHs. Presumably, that is readily available information, I would have thought. I'm not asking for the moon.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Chairman, I have a number of things to say about eastern Ontario. I think I might start with a couple of personal incidents which have happened in my experience in politics in Ottawa.

One relates to a woman whose child was emotionally disturbed and who from her home in Ottawa, sought in vain to get treatment for this child for a period of 3½ to four years. She has eventually managed to get care for her child but the care is in Toronto. The child has been made a ward of the Children's Aid Society in Toronto, at the insistence of the local Children's Aid Society, in order that it could enter a facility in the Toronto area. The Children's Aid Society has complete control over whether or not she can even see her child and the answer is usually not.

Since she is of modest income, it is very difficult for her even to afford to be able to come down and see the child when it is down here. This is a child of about 8½ or nine, and she has been living through this personal emotional, physical and financial hell for a period of 3½ or four years, trying to get adequate care for this child.

Another relates to the problems of teenagers—and I have come into contact with a number—who become mentally ill, who threaten suicide or other such drastic measures, and for whom there is literally no way of caring in the Ottawa area.

The local hospitals can take them for a few days if, somehow, they can find room for them. Often as not, they send them down to the Brockville Hospital which is outside the eastern Ontario public health region. There they are simply kept in what amounts to custodial care with very little treatment until it is decided that perhaps they can be sent home. When they are sent home, there is no aftercare. There is no means of helping these kids to survive in the community and there are no facilities especially designed in order to help ease them back into society.

We are to live with this—my wife and myself and other people in the community—because of the neglect of facilities for psychiatric care in eastern Ontario. I have some figures here of which the minister should be aware, and if he isn't, I'll make him aware.

Taking the standards—and I don't necessarily agree with them—prepared by his department, there should be approximately 300 acute treatment beds for psychiatric disorders in eastern Ontario. We are short of that by about 30 per cent. There are about 214.

As far as long-term and intermediate care for the psychiatrically ill in eastern Ontario is concerned, there are no such beds in eastern Ontario, in the region. The department standards would have somewhat over 500. There are none. Ottawa is the only major city in the country, let alone the province, not to have its own facilities for long- and intermediate-term treatment. Patients who are put into long- and intermediate care have to go to Brockville, which is 90 miles away and which creates tremendous problems because of the separation between the patient and the patient's family and friends.

Six years ago—five years ago—there were 18 beds in Ottawa for acute treatment of children who are mentally ill. The department says by its standards there should be about 140 in eastern Ontario; there are still 18.

In fact, that is quite an interesting story. About two years ago there was authorization made to the Royal Ottawa Hospital to prepare plans. Under the then minister (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), plans were proposed; they were presented to the department and the department said, "We're sorry. These aren't very good plans." They had been prepared within the cost guidelines presented by the department.

The hospital went back and they were told, "Come back with the best scheme you

can imagine." They did so. They came back and it was too high, but they had been told to come back with the best scheme. They had asked in vain for cost guidelines within which they could work; they were not given any until they presented a plan.

At that point they were told to cut back to a budget that was very close to the original budget. The consequence is that they are less happy with the plan they came up with than the original plan—that's children's beds. There are no intermediate facilities and no long-term facilities for kids in eastern Ontario. There's space for 10 children a day in day-care. There are no facilities, public or private, for caring for emotionally disturbed people in eastern Ontario.

As for care for the mentally retarded, again there are no facilities in the eastern Ontario health region. While there are facilities at the Rideau regional school at Smiths Falls, that hospital has set a rated capacity of just over 1,000; it currently has just under 2,000 patients or inmates. The eastern Ontario region should have approximately 1,000 places for the mentally retarded, by the department's own standards, and it has none.

Perhaps I could ask the minister what in fact he intends to do, because I think the situation is deplorable. What makes me particularly angry is to find the kind of investment that is going on in psychiatric services in other parts of the province, with no apparent sense of priorities or of the very urgent needs that exist in the eastern part of the province.

Hon. Mr. Potter: First of all, that proposed extension of the Royal Ottawa Hospital wasn't for children; it was an adult extension. The $1 million was the original estimate from the hospital itself. When the plans came in they weren't satisfactory and they were returned and the hospital was told to bring them in along with some other recommendations we had made.

It should be pointed out that the approval was made for the $1-million extension and, at that time, which was just in December 1971, they came back and said they weren't prepared to reduce it to $1.5 million. And if they weren't prepared to reduce it to $1.5 million, they were just not in business because we only had $1 million in the estimates for that project and they knew that when we started.

Mr. Cassidy: The hospital wasn't told, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think now we are on the road. Just within the past week I have been in touch with them about this, and I think everything is going to be worked out there. As far as the mentally retarded is concerned—

Mr. Cassidy: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman, could I just say a word about that before the minister goes on? I want to ask, if things went so smoothly, why is it that the psychiatric director at the hospital had a heart attack during the course of the second series of negotiations because he was so shocked at the attitude of the department?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Don't give me that guff and start suggesting that he was shocked about the attitude of the department!

Insofar as the mentally retarded are concerned, as the member is well aware, we have been talking about this for many months now. We have a programme under way to try to relieve the congestion in these places.

I am well aware of the congestion at Smiths Falls and other places, because I've been there in the last few months visiting them and I know what has to be done. We are opening a place in Picton. We are going to relieve the congestion at Smiths Falls gradually by getting them into Picton and other areas in the province. We are opening them all over the province. It can't be done overnight, and I'm sure the member will agree with this philosophy.

By the same token, there is no way we are going to build more of the large monuments like we had in the past. We want to get them into smaller institutions. But this is the programme over the next few years, and I anticipate that we will meet our goal and within five years we will have solved the problem. But we can't do it today or tomorrow.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe I could ask the minister and be very precise and very specific now. Over the next five years, he said, there will be solutions. As he is aware, people in eastern Ontario have been looking for solutions for far more than five years already and have been getting little or no action from the department.

Will the minister commit the department now to take measures that would at least alleviate the problems that exist in eastern Ontario within the next year so that the region does not have to wait for this five-year period? They are fed up to the teeth

with promises, the minister must be aware—and if he isn't I'll tell him that—the people in the area are fed up to the teeth with the promises that are not accompanied by action.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I hope that the people—

Mr. Cassidy: Will the minister—

An hon. member: Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I hope the people in the Ottawa area are prepared to be really serious as they say they are and stop fighting amongst themselves in the various hospitals and trying to come in the back door to get things done and work through their hospital planning council or now, hopefully, through their new district health council. In this way they will assist us in planning the needs for the area instead of each hospital deciding to promote its own particular activity. Certainly, I'll give you a commitment. With the assistance of the people in the area, we'll work out a solution to their problems.

Mr. Cassidy: Let me be very, very specific. One of the things that you can do and you have powers to do is to endorse and supply the funds for a very substantial commitment to outpatient services, for adults, for teenagers and for kids, that would permit services now to people who are forced to be shunted out of the region, or who don't get care at all. I'm sure the minister is aware that you don't have to have a bed to treat all of the people who come in looking for treatment. Were this to be done in the next six months, this would, at least, go some of the way to offsetting the problems we have right now. Would you commit yourself to that, to a very substantial increase, to supplying the staff that would be put with the beds that should be there, well in advance of actually getting the beds in place?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We talked before this, Mr. Chairman, about planning the total health needs of an area. I'm hopeful that with the council, as it will be set up in Ottawa, it will be prepared properly to review and survey, recommend, plan and develop the total health needs of the community, which will take into consideration not only our physical health, but our mental health as well. We've also talked before about the need of mental community health centres, the purpose of which is to treat these patients on an outpatient basis. They're treated a heck of a lot better in their own home than they are in an institution.

We're anxious to have as a backup, some active treatment beds in a psychiatric wing of a hospital, strictly as a backup for these community mental health centres. Then, we have to have our institutions for those who require longer term care. This is the plan, not only for the Ottawa area, but for other areas of the province, too. I can't make any more specific statement than that, but I can tell you this is what we want to see done. With the co-operation and the assistance of the people of the community this is what we're going to see done.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I'd like some specifics, because I really find that unacceptable. What the minister is saying is that the district health council, as it gets going, can take over the planning for this. That's fine, but the minister is well aware that that's not going to be done overnight. That regional health council will take a certain amount of time for them to get organized; it will take time for them to begin to meet. There will be other problems and other priorities besides psychiatric problems to deal with.

The needs that we're talking about now are needs that should have been met five and 10 years ago. You cannot simply shelve it off to a health council which has got other problems, too, and say when they come up with some answers in two or three or four years time, then the government will begin to act. It might be possible in another part of the province where there is a fairly adequate network of services right now, but that fairly adequate network of services does not exist in eastern Ontario. There's virtually nothing, outside of the Ottawa metropolitan region, and what is in the Ottawa region is itself inadequate, as the minister, I'm sure, is aware. What I'm asking, very specifically, is what will you do this year in order to provide certain kinds of community mental health care well in advance of setting up community mental health centres and things like that?

These are great ideas. I would endorse the minister's going ahead with them, but they're not going to be set up overnight. We have a hospital there which is prepared and equipped and anxious, the Royal Ottawa Hospital, which is the regional mental health treatment centre and which is capable of absorbing the staff and of using the staff in the community. That's surely one place to start. We have a number of projects for halfway houses and hostels and things like that, which would help to relieve

pressure on Brockville or on the Rideau regional school, but which are held up, because of a lack of commitment from the Department of Health for the capital funding. What, specifically, is the minister prepared to do?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to make any statement that I can't back up and, at the present time, I can see no way that I can help out in this specific case. I've told you before, when this thing is properly planned, when we have an opportunity to discuss it with them and plan it, then we're prepared to act. It would be very easy for me to get up here and say, "Sure, I agree with you. We'll put people up there; we'll start mental health clinics."

I don't think it's going to be possible this year, and if I don't think it's going to be possible, I'm not going to suggest it, but we'll certainly do all we can to help.

Mr. Cassidy: I expected better, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid).

Mr. Cassidy: If I could just say a final word, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is it repetitious?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He is never repetitious.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, I would hope not.

Mr. Chairman: I would hope not, too.

Mr. Stokes: Why not wait and find out?

Mr. Cassidy: I just really expected better of a minister who came in with such a fine reputation and then winds up by promising absolutely nothing.

Mr. Deans: The member for Ottawa Centre is never repetitious.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words on this vote. I would like to dissociate myself from the remarks of the previous speaker, as usual, because we're willing on this side, I think to a certain extent, to give the new minister a chance to see what he can do. We feel on this side, I think, that he is one of the more honest ministers over on that side.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Up to now.

Mr. Reid: So far. Sometimes—

An hon. member: There is only one over there.

Mr. Reid: Sometimes we get the feeling that he may be running a bluff, but we are willing to give him—

An hon. member: Give him the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Reid: —at this point in time the benefit of the doubt. But we are looking for a little action to back up the brave words he has given out, not only here in the Legislature but also to the press.

I would like to speak, if I may, Mr. Chairman, about the mental retardation programme and to ask some specific questions which relate particularly to my riding. The last line of the explanation of the programme description reads "that the programme includes facilities established and operated by the government as well as those operated by a local agency with financial assistance from the Ministry of Health." Now the minister is, and has been in receipt of the Williston report for some time.

If some members would make as much noise into the microphone as they do sotto voce, we'd be better off. Wouldn't we, yes?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I am sorry.

Mr. Reid: Well I wasn't referring to the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Lewis: No, but he includes himself.

Mr. Reid: But perhaps he wasn't speaking to me either.

I would like to know specifically what kind of assistance is available for the institutions known as ARC Industries which provide employment and jobs, if that is the word, for the mentally retarded. What assistance is available when these facilities want to expand their operation, both in physical plant and personnel to provide jobs within the home community, activities that will keep the mentally retarded occupied and to provide a service to the community and something that is a service to themselves also.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is not in my bailiwick, Mr. Chairman. That is Community and Social Services.

Mr. Reid: Well, just one more word. That pretty well ends that discussion, but may I ask the minister, do we refer this to the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle) or do we refer it to the superminister who is supposed to have overall direction for this thing? Or does anybody really know what is going on?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Of course, that is one prerogative you have got. You can decide where you want to refer it. All I can say is that it is not my pigeon, I can't do much about it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview (Mr. Singer).

Mr. Reid: The minister is rapidly becoming a bird of a different type. Does he have any concern—

An hon. member: Come off it.

Mr. Reid: Does he have any concern for this? Where does it fit into the overall scheme of health services in this province? The minister shakes his head and he says: "Well it is not my concern, ask somebody else."

Mr. Stokes: He said it wasn't his pigeon.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Let's be reasonable. You are asking me a question that doesn't fall within my estimates, eh?

An hon. member: Right.

Hon. Mr. Potter: And you are bound I am going to give you an answer. There is no way I am going to give you an answer. There is no way I am going to give you an answer because I don't know. I am suggesting to you you ask somebody who is responsible for it and get your answer.

Mr. Martel: You will get a blast now.

Mr. Reid: That certainly makes eminent good sense, but I would have hoped that the delivery of health services in this province would have been the total concern of the minister whose estimates are before us today.

Mr. Lewis: You should give him a chance, he is a new minister.

Mr. Shulman: Aren't you sorry you didn't stop when I interrupted you?

Mr. Reid: You are right, I should have listened to you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Reid: I won't make that mistake again.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the minister may be aware of a conference that took place here in Toronto at Hart House a few days ago—a national conference dealing with the question of rehabilitation of offenders. At that conference there were people present from the minister's department; there were people from all across Canada.

One of the concerns expressed there—and I thing it is a very valid concern—was the treatment available in various provinces, and particularly what I want to ask the minister about is psychiatric treatment available in our reform institutions for people who have need of it.

There were several judicial people there and Crown attorneys and others, who along with me recognize that many people, who come before our courts and who have to be dealt with, stand in serious need of psychiatric treatment. There just aren't the facilities available in this province to allow judges on the three levels—Supreme Court, county court and provincial level—adequately to send these people off to somewhere where they are going to get treatment. There are provisions in the Criminal Code that allow this sort of thing. Perhaps there need to be some changes in the Criminal Code along this line.

That isn't something we can deal with here; that has got to be dealt with in Ottawa. But what did bother me very much, as I listened to the discussion, was a recognition that there is not available in this province adequate facilities in conjunction with our own reform institutions which could allow the reasonable or logical treatment of those people who have run afoul of the law.

Many of them don't belong in penal institutions where they are just going to be locked up and some attempt is going to be made at giving them rehabilitated training. It just doesn't work. Many of them need serious psychiatric care over a period of time. The courts just don't have available to them the facilities in this province that they can send those people to. Perhaps the minister is going to suggest that there is a federal responsibility, and probably there is as well. But there is no overriding provincial responsibility.

We have to look at the number of our

people whom we send to prison. We have to recognize that a fair percentage of those people are in urgent need of some kind of psychiatric treatment. Finally, we have to recognize that psychiatric treatment for people in that condition just isn't available, and all of the tragedy that flows from that—suicides, worsening of conditions, and so on. I would like to know if the minister has any particular views on this, and what, if any, programme he has along these lines.

An hon. member: Sounds like a leadership speech to me.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is very little I can say to that, Mr. Chairman, except that I do appreciate the problem that we are faced with. This has been brought up before; we have seen it reported in the paper many times. The hon. member no doubt is aware, as I have mentioned here before, of the difficulty we have in obtaining enough psychiatrists in the province, not only in mental hospitals and institutions, but in this type of facility too. It is a matter that we are continually looking at and we are advertising all over. We are glad to accept any recommendations that we might have from anybody about how we can solve this particular problem. I haven't any remedy for it at the present time, except to say that we are continually searching for more psychiatrists to try to alleviate this situation.

Mr. Singer: You see, Mr. Chairman, what happens so often is that a person charged with an offence comes before the court. The provincial judge says, "I am going to remand you in Toronto to the Don for an examination." The report comes back that the person is fit to stand trial, which really is quite meaningless. The ability to stand trial means that they are physically able to be there and stand on their own feet, possibly able to understand, but not bad enough—I guess, as far as this cursory examination has been able to discover—to say, "No, that person isn't really able properly to understand what is going on. He is unable reasonably to instruct counsel, and isn't able reasonably to defend himself." So really what happens at the Don is so unsatisfactory.

Then, we have Penetang up here which deals only with male prisoners. If female prisoners get into the same position, where do you send them—to Vanier or somewhere? The facilities for female prisoners who are in need of psychiatric attention are almost non-existent in the province. When you look at the fantastic cost that Canadians and Ontario people have to put forward to keep people in jail, one wonders if there couldn't be more done by providing psychiatric services in connection with our penal institutions. There must be a great deal more. We haven't even begun to scratch the surface in Ontario, the advanced province—Ontario with all these ideas.

But you look in that field and really, it is embarrassing to one who has something to do with the whole process of law. I gather the minister is equally embarrassed. I would like to see some kind of an effort begun to be made in trying to provide reasonable facilities. All you have to do is look in the courts at city hall in the morning and see the people who have been remanded to the Don and come back with the usual certificate that they are fit to stand trial. It applies equally, apparently, across Canada from one end to the other. But Ontario should know better and should be able to do better.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, this is something on which I happen to have some knowledge. The member is quite wrong. There has been a tremendous improvement made in the last two years. Perhaps he doesn't know that when someone is remanded to the Don for mental examination, the doctor who did the examination, if one can call it that, was a general practitioner who looked at the various prisoners—they were in a common cage—and he would say, "That one is sane and that one isn't." He picked them out that way.

It was an absolute disgrace, and that situation is changed. Every prisoner who goes in for a mental examination is now seen by a psychiatrist. They are not kept in a common cage. They are kept in a private cell, and the situation at the Don has improved incredibly in a relatively short time.

Mr. Singer: May I just reply to that? While it may have improved, and I don't disagree with what the member for High Park says, it still is a long long way from being meaningful to anticipate that a few minutes of psychiatric examination really gets to the root of the problem that the judge asked be solved. That would be dreaming in Technicolor. There isn't time—there aren't the facilities available—to really examine a particular accused person and determine anything more than whether or not the person is fit to stand trial.

And that, in law, is a meaningless test. What does "fit to stand trial" mean? Does it mean that they are able to stand on their

own feet and mumble something to the lawyer who may be defending them? Do they understand? Are they able? Is this what society should do with them—determine whether or not they are fit to stand trial?

If they are fit to stand trial, and if they are convicted, then what do we do to them? We send them to a penal institution, lock them up. Hopefully, somebody is going to give them some psychiatric treatment if they need it at a later stage. But "hopefully" is pretty dim and pretty far off in the future.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, do you have any comments? The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): Like the member for Rainy River, I would like to extend full courtesy to the minister so that he would have a chance to prove his worth. At the same time I would like to address some of my remarks to what I said this afternoon about what exists at the moment in Ontario. This is a two-class system of psychiatric care—private and general hospitals for the middle class, and the large provincial hospitals for the lower class.

There seems to be a discrepancy between the stated intentions of the chief planner for the province, which is the minister, and some of the members of his department, and above all, between the minister and organized psychiatry in hospitals and the department of psychiatry in the University of Toronto.

At the University of Toronto, and I think by some of the members of your department, Mr. Minister, mental health tends to be viewed as a medical problem, and the provision of mental health services tends to be organized as if they were medical services. An alternative to the model for organizing mental health care, is the "social psychiatric model." This allows for the fact that mental health problems are multifactorial in origin, and recognizes that the medically trained psychiatrist is not necessarily the ideally trained person to deal exclusively with this problem.

This conceptualization recognizes that many mental health problems are less medical than social in origin, and that the most effective help may come from someone who gets intensive training in social and psychological sciences rather than in medical sciences. This approach opens a whole new reservoir of skills and personnel which can be brought to bear on the problem of providing mental health care.

The ideological differences between the people who design the services and the people who deliver them at the moment have to be bridged over.

I think that we have to look at the origin of what is occurring in Ontario. We should look probably at the blueprint of why we are organizing psychiatric services as they are now and not as they really should be, according to more scientifically validated and more up-todate methods of doing this. To understand the development of the present system, we really have to look to three major reports on mental health. One is an American report and two are from Canada. One of the two is a Canadian one generally and the other is an Ontario one specifically.

The American report, published in 1961, is called, "Action for Mental Health," which is the final report of the joint commission on mental illness and health. The term "joint commission" refers to equal participation of APA and AMA. The Canadian equivalent of it is called, "More for the Mind," which is a study published in 1963, of psychiatric services in Canada under general editorship of J. S. Tyhurst and the sponsorship of the National Scientific Planning Council of CMHA. The last report is one published in 1970 which is the report of the Ontario Council of Health.

I will deal, first, with the American report because of the importance that the American report has had for the development of psychiatric and mental health facilities in the US, and describe the equal importance that our own Canadian equivalent, which is "More for the Mind," has had on development of services here in Ontario. The difference between the two is very important because the American one has been very broadly based and the Canadian one has been rather narrow.

"Action for Mental Health" is an extensive study made by experts under the sponsorship of 36 organizations making up the commission. Their opening statements are broad, non-ideological and scientifically cool.

> Mental illness involves so many complexities, biological, chemical, psychological and social, that we do not presume to present wholly definitive conclusions or universally approved recommendations.

This is a very important statement because I shall later quote to you what the Canadian study says, which is infinitely more narrow in its intellectual approach. This intellectual climate of questioning experimentations that pervades the joint commission report is reflected in their recommendations. Only some

of the basic principles will I mention now since the report is very extensive. The report's influence has been germinal on the development of mental health services in the US. I shall quote its first recommendation on manpower, training and utilization policy. The major one has been:

> In the absence of more specific and definitive scientific evidence of the causes of mental illness, psychiatry and the allied mental health professions should adopt and practise a growth liberal philosophy of what constitutes and who can do treatment within the framework of the hospitals, clinics and other professional service agencies, particularly in relation to persons with psychosis, severe personality or character disorders that incapacitate them for work, family life and everyday activity.

The second point they are making is that all mental health professions should recognize that certain kinds of medical, psychiatric and neurological examinations and treatments must be carried out by or under the immediate direction of psychiatrists, neurologists or other physicians especially trained for those procedures. Secondly, psychoanalysis and allied forms of deeply searching and probing —what they call depth psychotherapy—must be practised only by those who are trained in it. Other health workers shall be permitted to do general short-term psychotherapy in a variety of settings by institutions, groups and individuals, but in all cases it should be undertaken under some kind of auspices of recognized mental health agencies.

This report led to the major development of a federal community mental health centre programme, a number of drop-in centres and a whole network of associated and fairly exciting developments in some of the states of the US. The community mental health centre in the way it was envisaged by the American report was one part of the local human services system with close working ties with a variety of other providers.

The centre was expected to provide a very comprehensive service and be able to care for all forms of mental disorder in all age groups and all socio-economic circumstances. Its operation was expected to provide a minimum of five services—that is, inpatient, outpatient day care, partial emergency services, and community education and consultative services.

In addition to the five essential services there were envisaged five supplemental services which were pre-care and after-care programmes, rehabilitation services, specialized diagnostic programmes, training activities, research and evaluation programmes.

And this, as I mentioned, has lead to the development of a fairly exciting sort of non-sectarian approach to mental health in the United States. It is basically social in orientation and has abandoned the bugaboo of psychiatry which is relying on medicine, medical services, "medical model" and psychiatrists. It has led to a number of interesting solutions in terms of manpower and facilities.

Now, in our own system here in Ontario, the mental health care delivery system is directly related to the blueprint first articulated, as I mentioned, in "More for the Mind". It is colloquially called the Tyhurst report. I want to examine the Tyhurst report in some detail as there are now serious questions about the validity of their approach and assumptions and the consequent effect on systems of delivery.

The serious inadequacies of the "More for the Mind" model as compared with the American joint commission report can no longer be ignored. Though the report was published in 1963 it is still in operation right now and it's strongly believed by the leaders and opinion makers of our department of psychiatry at the University of Toronto. Our own Ontario Council of Health report tends to support most of the recommendations of the Tyhurst report, with a few exceptions, though I do recognize that in practice in a number of the hospitals there has been an attempt to break away from the constricting model that's articulated in "More for the Mind."

The report was written by eight psychiatrists and does not attempt, as is stated in the foreword by Dr. Griffin, to include references to the whole field of mental health as is defined by psychologists, sociologists, educationists and social workers. Dr. Griffin states the report does attempt to review critically treatment services for those who are mentally ill, and to present a new idea defining these services.

"Mental illness" is, however, broadly defined. It refers not only to those who are so incapacitated that hospital treatment is necessary but also to those who are moderately or even mildly disabled by psychiatric illness. "In all instances however, mental illness is regarded as a disorder or breakdown of living requiring psychiatric treatment. In this field"—I quote directly from

the report — the medically qualified psychiatrist is the acknowledged authority."

That I think is where the trouble arises—if from the beginning it is assumed that no one else can be as qualified as a psychiatrist to deliver the necessary mental health services.

So that the keynote of the report is that mental illness should be dealt with in the same organizational, administrative and professional framework as physical illness. And I think that really is open to question.

Following this bold statement of the report and blithely ignoring the possibility of that what we now call "mental illness" may not be an illness in the medical sense, but something else and that in fact the conceptualization of the mental health problem in the framework of the disease model is inappropriate to use for planning and programme design in the field of mental health, the committee proceeds to warn that a bold new approach is needed, a breakthrough from the restricting effects of the ideas from the past.

Consequently the committee recommends in its "bold new spirit" that all psychiatric services be integrated with the physical and personnel resources of the rest of medicine. The integration of mental health services with the physical and personal resource of the rest of medicine, the committee contends, will help reduce the stigma of segregation, will raise the standards of the medical care and will increase the acceptance of the psychiatric illness by the medical profession.

Consequent upon this assumption, the psychiatrist then remains and must remain firmly in authority over all personnel and treatment modalities, though the treatment should be eclectic, because the lack of knowledge of how to deal with mental health problems is appalling; it is hardly recognized by the medical profession at the moment.

What we have done in Ontario is to build a number of psychiatric units in the general hospitals. And if we accept on principle that this is what we should do, then in fact we should adopt and apply this consistently and consequently throughout the whole province. It is a very expensive process because it depends entirely on the use of general hospital beds and the psychiatrists generally.

We have failed on two major accounts. One, I think it is absolutely impossible to implement this approach fully and logically and consistently. There will never be enough psychiatrists and we should not rely on it. So what we have done is we have created a number of units, and we treat some people and not the others at the psychiatric units of general hospitals.

There are two types of people who are treated in the psychiatric units of general hospitals. Quite often they are the ones who are interesting cases, the individuals who had the first outbreak of their illness, while the other major criterion is the class of origin.

I return again to the point I was making before, that if you are poor, if you have had a number of problems in the psychiatric field, if you have had a number of occurrences or a number of "illnesses," you end up in what is generally considered by most people—though not by me—as an inferior facility, which is the Ontario Hospital system. We could never really give this full treatment to the poor people in the so-called first-class facility. We refer all the ones who have suffered from the social system, the people who have constant social problems, to the psychiatric hospitals of our Ontario Hospital system. So we have created a two-class system.

Also, by concentrating entirely on the medical approach, you close the avenue to any type of research or a newer approach, to a newer definition or a more acceptable scientific redefinition of what is a mental health problem. You also close the avenue to implementation of what the minister so strongly believes, that mental health services in the psychiatric field should in fact be delivered by other personnel than psychiatrists in the medical field.

It will be impossible for us unless we break away from the conceptual model of the hospital to do this to any extent, because the general hospital will dominate the psychiatric unit within the concept of the medical model. And we know what kind of treatment people usually get in the psychiatric units of general hospitals; it is what they call the usual medical treatment for a medical illness, which is shock treatments and medications. The social manipulations and the more involved and individualized psychotherapy are rarely or very seldom provided because of the pressure in the units to do the job fast and get the patients out because the beds are so damned expensive.

The same preoccupation with the medical model and the move to the general hospitals, I think, has cut down considerably on the

development of all these supportive community resource systems—drop-in places, open houses, halfway houses, treatment by people who are non-medical, at-home treatment, or even general self-help which could be done by individuals themselves.

As a corollary to this we have also, in fact, awarded the psychiatric profession the large plums of great financial reward for the jobs that they don't do particularly well at the moment. We have produced an incredible monopoly for the one particular profession, when by now, it's scientifically evident, I think—especially when you look at the work done in the sociological and psychological fields—that, under no conditions, is the primacy of knowledge in the hands of medicine in respect of psychiatry. It has already passed to the other disciplines. Our preoccupation with this system and with the Tyhurst report locks us in, in the most unfortunate way, in that we are no longer as scientifically correct, which is as close to being ideologically correct as we would hope, and as has happened in the USA when they opened up, by their much more multifactorial approach, the mental health field to new developments, new research and newer approaches.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Scarborough West asked about the psychiatrists. I've got all the Ontario Hospitals here. Do you want me to list the recommended number on what we've got? Brockville recommended eight, now has five. Goderich six and three; Hamilton 15 and 13; Kingston 16 and 13; Lakeshore 14 and 11; North Bay 10 and 3; London 7 and 11. What happened there? Owen Sound three and three; Penetang seven and five; Porcupine three and two; Thunder Bay seven and two. I told you before there was one. That fellow's not leaving till next week. Two today. St. Thomas 17 and 9; Toronto 14 and 12; Whitby 14 and 8; Woodstock three and one.

Mr. Lewis: What was the second last—London?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Woodstock. Oh.

Mr. Lewis: 14 and 8?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Whitby.

Mr. Lewis: Whitby.

Hon. Mr. Potter: And Woodstock three and one.

Mr. Lewis: These are psychiatric complements?

Hon. Mr. Potter: These are psychiatrists.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, what about Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Potter: 15 and 13.

Mr. Lewis: 15 and 13. What happens in places like North Bay and Thunder Bay and St. Thomas and Whitby, where you're so short? What happens to the patient allocation? What happens to levels of care? What kind of auxiliary staff compensations do you have? What goes on when your patient load remains the same and your psychiatric response diminishes?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I imagine the same thing that happens with family physicians.

Mr. Lewis: Sorry, I didn't hear.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I imagine the same situation happens as is happening today with the family physicians, when people are demanding so many more services and, as you know, they'll see twice as many patients in an office in an afternoon as they would like to see, or as they would want to see, but because the demand is there, they have to do it. And the same thing happens here. They do come into these hospitals as often as we can arrange it, part-time psychiatrists who come in and help out.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, would you like to make any comments on the hon. member for Parkdale's comments before we—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, really—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He just gave a speech.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't know what I can say. I know there's a lot of things wrong with the mental health programme and we're trying to develop it—

Mr. Chairman: You have no comments. That is vote 2304 carried? One question?

Mr. Lewis: Put it again.

Mr. Dukszta: I was interested to know where the minister stands in terms of this reconceptualization? That's what I was interested in. I know I spoke for too long and I lost you ages ago, but that's my fault. But the question is, do you accept mental illness as being a disease and really fitting within the psychiatrist's province and the province of medicine; or do you accept it as a broader definition in that the other people should be involved in it? That was the question implied.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I accept the broader definition as part of the whole context of health care.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2304?

Mr. Lewis: Just a second, Mr. Chairman. My colleague from Parkdale made a number of points, both this afternoon and this evening, which seemed to me to strike to the root of the system.

The first that I would like the minister to respond to, because it interests one in terms of the evolution of health care, is the basic argument that private psychiatry and the psychiatric wings of the general hospitals tend to service the middle class and that the low income earners, if you will, by and large in Ontario, who suffer whatever degree of mental illness or emotional disturbance find their way into the OH system. I am not making any qualitative judgement on the system; I am talking about the incidence of economic separation that occurs between this kind of class-biased series of psychiatric models.

Now, let me ask just out of curiosity—because the National Association of Mental Health in the United States, as I recall it, and many, many studies that have been reported in the Journal of Ortho-Psychiatry, have indicated time and again this sort of class separation by way of mental health response—I would like to know whether at any time the mental health division has done a study of income background in the various receiving services in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, we haven't done a study here on it. It might be worthwhile doing. Certainly as a physician I have never run into that problem. All patients are treated the same. Any who were referred to a psychiatric hospital were referred because it was felt that we were unable to provide the proper type of care for them at our local hospital or as an outpatient, but perhaps this is a different situation when you get into a city the size of Toronto. I don't know but I would like to look into it and find out.

I just can't buy this concept that it is the poor people who go to a mental hospital. That is not what the purpose of the mental hospital is. The purpose of the mental hospital, as far as I am concerned, is for the chronic cases that can't be handled in the local psychiatric wing of a hospital or can't be handled on a outpatient basis.

Mr. Lewis: For years the Ontario Hospital system has served as rather more than that; it has served—am I wrong?—as an acute treatment model. Once we brought in the homes for special care, and moved out of the Ontario Hospital system people who had been incarcerated for years and years in back wards—the old hair-raising tale—and began to change the Ontario Hospital model, clearly it became more and more oriented to acute treatment.

You read off some per diems earlier, I can recall when per diems in Orillia and Smith Falls were $5.45 a day during my life in the Legislature, and I haven't been here very long; only eight or nine years. It seems an eternity but it is not in fact very long. And I recall when the OHs were down to $9, $10 and $11 a day in very recent memory. So if you are now spending $25 to $49 a day in your OHs on active treatment then it is—I am not going to fight about it—of a rather more sophisticated degree of treatment and care. Okay.

The question arises not about the catchment area but about the people who come to use the OH system and you say, "Well it doesn't discriminate in that sense." But you see if a private individual, if a member of this Legislature—I can choose this Legislature as a perfect crucible because everybody here is in such a state of obvious mental health—but suppose some one member weren't, and he sought some psychiatric support? Clearly if one goes to an individual psychiatrist or one enters a wing of a general hospital, the one-to-one relationship or the manpower that is available is very great.

But if you haven't got the resources to compensate for the 10 per cent difference to go to an independent psychiatrist who charges $10, $15 or $20 an hour beyond the approved OMA fee schedule—and many do for individual and group therapy—or if you are in a community where it is more logical to go to an OH rather than a psychiatric ward of a general hospital, or there isn't a psychiatric ward of a general hospital, or the beds are full in a psychiatric ward of a general hospital, then what treatment do you get?

How do you get appropriate treatment if you have got three out of 10 psychiatrists available in North Bay? How do you get it if you have got two out of seven of the complement in Thunder Bay? How do you get it if you have got nine out of 17 available in St. Thomas, or eight out of 14 in Whitby?

The nature of the Ontario Hospital system indicates the treatment which is re-

ceived and if that system has within it a large number of patients from lower income brackets simply because that is the way it operates, then clearly the quality of service will be less. Clearly then we are reinforcing a class system in the field of mental health, which in large measure we have broken down in the field of physical illness.

I mean we even persist in terms of the funding formula, don't we? When we go to the next vote on OHSIP, you will be talking about the federal contribution to an Ontario Health Services Insurance Plan and an Ontario Hospital Services Insurance Plan. But you tell me in this vote where the federal contribution is—because the blessed federal government, for cost-sharing purposes, hasn't even yet agreed to mental health as an appropriate object for support. They have already made a distinction which relegates mental health to a secondary level in every province in Canada simply by refusing to provide a cost-sharing subsidy.

All right, so immediately it is second class, regardless of the 50 to 60 per cent of the beds in the province at any given time being occupied by people who have problems of emotional disturbance or mental illness. The money isn't there for the funding, so obviously when the priorities are allocated mental health is a little lower. And given that immediate reduction in importance because it isn't part of the cost-sharing formula we then, I think, create another separation which is most worrisome, a separation which may well tend to reflect class.

I am saying "may" because I am not positive; but everything I know about the way in which this society works, the catchment areas for the OHs; the people whom I have seen in the outpatient departments; the psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers I speak to, suggests to me that the OHs serve largely a given economic sector of the population, and I would have thought that by this point in time the government of Ontario might have had a sufficient interest to look into it.

The member for Rainy River said that he would like to give this minister a chance, and every member in the House probably feels that way emotionally. But we have gone through—with the greatest of respect—the man who is so gently and amiably snoozing beside you, the member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond), who will shortly tell me combatively that he has never been more awake in his life; then we went through the member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), and then we went through the esteemed Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence).

We have been through one Health Minister after another in my memory in this Legislature of nine years now, and this extraordinary situation which my colleague from Ottawa Centre outlined tonight, for all of eastern Ontario, has not changed one jot from 1963 to 1972 in terms of the immediate area outside Ottawa which he was talking about; the number-of-beds ratio which he read off which nobody contradicted in terms of the department's own figures. All of us have suffered the aggravation which the minister has now inherited of trying to find institutions for the placement of adolescents, for the placement of kids, or to find appropriate settings for adults, whether it is for emotional disturbances or otherwise.

I listened to the new, young, strong member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell) on the government side in his Throne Speech, Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago—was it Aurora that he was talking about? Orillia, the Ontario Hospital school in Orillia? I heard that speech almost word for word from the member for High Park four years ago; the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) made that speech six years ago; the member for Woodbine, Ken Bryden, when he was in the House made that speech in 1964, and your own member makes the same speech in 1972 expressing the—I don't know how one describes it—the agony and humiliation and guilt and self-consciousness and embarrassment that any member of the House would feel when you walk through Orillia or Smiths Falls or Aurora or whatever. The same procession is repeated year after year without any sense of qualitative change.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): You could buy Coles notes.

Mr. Lewis: Coles notes? Yes, you could do that, you could do a nice Coles notes speech. Do you want me to do that?

Mr. Singer: Read it next Tuesday in the Sun.

Mr. Lewis: We haven't even talked about the readmission rates in the Ontario Hospitals; we haven't talked much about the nature of the per diems and what it means; in this estimate, for whatever reason, we are not going into some of the repetitive patterns that have existed before because the

minister is new, and everybody wishes to give him a chance.

But let him understand that the conditions he inherits are not new. They have run through three predecessors in eight short years, and his own backbench is still talking of exactly the same problem.

What the member for Parkdale is saying to you, Mr. Minister, on top of all the other things that emerge in this House, is: number one, we have moved so slowly that we may well have embedded a class system in mental health over the years, from which it will be difficult to extricate ourselves; and number two, we have been so dependent on the medical model and we have so enshrined the medical aristocracy in the field of mental health, that it may be very difficult to return it, or indeed to redirect it, into therapeutic areas which are perhaps less professionally trained, but vastly more responsive than those areas which have persisted up until now. And that's because of the passage of time and the refusal of the government to respond in this particular field. And there are few fields you have inherited, sir, which are as important as this one.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2304 carried?

Mr. Dukszta: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I must have been elected, in spite, not because of my ability to express myself.

I will just make it very short—a few remarks in terms of some factuarial support to what the member for Scarborough West was saying—in terms of the two-class system of delivery of mental health in Toronto.

I have worked, as I mentioned before, for many years in the Queen St. mental health centre which I consider an excellent institution of its type, providing both leadership and working within the incredible difficulty that the present system gives it. It is a very, very good place. It provides a very good treatment programme and it does the job very well.

But we cannot get away from the fact that the Queen St. mental health centre still takes 50 per cent of acutely disturbed individuals from the city of Toronto. That is in addition to the large chronic component which you mentioned.

Okay, a number of people come from the General Hospital psychiatric unit who need a longer-term treatment and they go to Queen St. mental health centre. But 50 per cent of all the individuals who need acute care treatment still go to Queen Street mental health centre, where they are dealt with very well.

When you look at them sociologically, they all come from the working class or the lower socio-economic structure. You don't see a professional among them, you don't see a middle class person among them. That is a fact we cannot escape. That is what is happening in spite of all of our best intentions, or, I should say, the department's best intentions.

If you are poor, if you are a repeater, if you have been beaten by life, you go to Queen St. mental health centre. If you are middle class or if you are upper class then you are routed into either the General Hospital or one of the major centres maybe, or if you are really rich, to the United States. You never, never end up in Queen St. mental health centre. I know that you may not be aware of it, Mr. Minister, but I think that you really should look into it. If you examine case by case, in term of class system, in terms of Hollingshead and Redlich systems you only see the two lowest classes there. No one else.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word before we finish this vote on the remarks made by the member for Scarborough West when he mentioned the Aurora Hospital. I would like not only to congratulate our present minister but the Ministers of Health of the past and their staff for the way they have upgraded the Aurora Hospital. Now, I take a personal interest in the Aurora Hospital because—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): They should upgrade them in northern Ontario too.

Mr. W. Hodgson: It's in my riding. I saw major changes within the last five years, especially in the recreation centre that they put on just about four years ago. It's been a great help to the patients in there. I was just in there last week at the Mental Health Week open house, Mr. Minister, and I want to congratulate your staff and yourself on what is going on up there. We are crowded up there and we could stand more space and I am sure that there are plans in the future not only to have them housed in our present building but at cottages and let them out more. Mr. Minister, again I would like to congratulate you and the staff at the Aurora Hospital for the great work they are doing with our mentally retarded.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the member for York North if he has visited

the Aurora Hospital on the floor where the patients sleep. Is he congratulating the minister and the department for the great work they have done there, where the beds are so close together you can't walk between them?

Mr. W. Hodgson: In answer to the member for High Park, I am not congratulating him on those conditions. I am congratulating him on the improvement they have made over the last five years.

Mr. Lewis: It is about time.

Mr. W. Hodgson: It is about time you give the government a little bit of credit for what it is doing.

Mr. Lewis: I gave the government great credit this afternoon. In fact, you were the chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2304 carried?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I'd just like to ask a question or two about the northeastern regional mental health centre. Since last year a number of developments have taken place there and there has been a great deal more utilization. There has been more staff hired and the programme has been expanded greatly, all of which certainly more than meets with my approval. I understand that the medical director who was there for some nine months or so has resigned. I wonder if the minister can tell us if there is a new medical director appointed or what plans are afoot to appoint one?

Hon. Mr. Potter: There hasn't been a new one appointed yet. That is still being considered.

Mr. Ferrier: Can the minister give us any idea how long it might take?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I couldn't give you any idea at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2304 carried?

Vote 2304 agreed to.

On vote 2305:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2305 carried?

Mr. Shulman: No. I just want to ask the minister what steps are being taken to control the overcharging that he is aware of throughout the OHSIP.

Mr. Martel: That should take an hour.

Hon. Mr. Potter: As you are aware at the present time, the college has now got teams going out into the hospitals to make sure about patient care, utilization of services, hospital beds and so on. We also now have people working with us we have hired on a part-time basis to help us pull the information from the computers, people specialized in this field, so that we have a better idea of what payments are being made in specific cases. Then, in addition to that, we are attempting spot checks to pull profiles to determine what appear to be abuses. These are being referred to the disciplinary committee to be reviewed.

Mr. Shulman: I am well aware that you are going after the people who are abusing the programme. What is being done about the programme itself? I am sure we have spoken about it and I know you agree with me, that there are certain areas in the programme where the fees are not in line with the services rendered, for example, the podiatrist, whom we spoke of in the House a few weeks ago, was doing nothing illegal. He was charging quite legally as the schedule allowed him to charge, and you are aware of things under the mat that doctors also can charge for which appear unreasonable. Have you any thoughts of changing the fee schedule?

Hon. Mr. Potter: At the present time, this is being discussed with various groups of paramedical people and the medical people and the dentists along the lines that you and I have discussed in the past to determine if we can't find some way of stopping this overcharging for services which are based on procedures. In many cases, they are defined as minor procedures, without giving any consideration to what the minor procedure might consists of. Is this the type of thing you are referring to? This is the type of thing we are now in the process of discussing with the various groups to see if we can't tighten up on that angle.

Mr. Shulman: Would the minister be bringing down some proposals or agreed-upon changes in that field before the OMA promulgates a new fee schedule?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2305 carried.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to understand just exactly what the minister has in mind in relation to the premium assistance form. I notice that there are some four items on these forms. One of those items has to do with the business of estimating one's 1972 income—that's the total income. I wonder—is there going to

be a check on that in 1973 and if, in fact, the person has underestimated that income, will there be an attempt on the part of the commission to recover that premium? How are you going to work that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is no way that that can be checked down. As a matter of fact the federal people won't let us check on it. That is income tax information which they won't make available, but the reason they are putting that estimate in there is to try to speed up the delivery of the plan the first of next year.

As you know, when people fill in an application form they declare their income for the previous year to see whether or not they are qualified. Last year they may not have qualified, but if this year they have an estimated income that isn't sufficient to let them pay their own premium, then they can estimate it and may be covered for assistance.

Mr. Gaunt: So there is going to be no attempt to double check the figures this year as an estimate as against the figures given next year as an actual income figure?

Hon. Mr. Potter: There will be spot checking, but it can't be done through the income tax people. It is pretty obvious. You may have run into them, I had one the other day. One of the members came to me and gave the names of a couple of people and he said: "I know they are getting free OHIP coverage," and he said, "I also know they made damned good incomes last year, so there is something wrong." Well in these cases we check them out.

Mr. Gaunt: I can appreciate that, but the point that I am wondering about is, in certain cases people have estimated their income and they thought that it would be what they estimated it to be and something happened during the course of the year so that they had a much greater income. My point was simply —are you going to try and recover the premiums that should have been paid during this year, based on the estimated income?

Hon. Mr. Potter: If they made that much more money, then yes, we have a responsibility to the taxpayers to collect the premiums they should have paid and we will do that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Gaunt: That will be tough administratively.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I know. We probably won't even hear about it.

Mr. Chairman: I have given the floor to the member for Parkdale. I will call the member for Ottawa Centre next.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of remarks, because I have already said some of it in the opening remarks to the estimates.

The OHIP as presently constituted does not cover all health care services and for those medical services that are covered it pays only 90 per cent of the OMA fee schedule. I know the minister has mentioned that he himself is concerned about this, and I would prefer that all costs which a patient incurs when he has a medical problem be covered by the government-sponsored insurance programme. When this will come in, I don't know, but I hope it will be soon.

As it is constituted now 90 per cent of what the patient incurs, the government pays; the other 10 per cent the patient has to pay himself. When it comes to psychiatric services—just to digress for a moment—it need not be only 10 per cent it can be much more. When you go to a specialist you may pay much more than the OMA fee because it depends very much on the individual doctor who charges you.

This 10 per cent has no effect on anyone who earns over $20,000 a year. It may have some effect for the 29 per cent of the families in Ontario who make over $10,000 a year. But, it has a definite effect on the 28 per cent of families in Ontario who make less than $5,500 a year. For them, I think a deterrent fee represents a major financial burden. It serves as a stark deterrent to the use of those services on which they are levied.

In the case of dental services, the deterrent fees are 100 per cent. So we must, in fact, change this.

I don't want to keep on coming back to it, because I obviously haven't got a hope in heaven with the minister that he will phase out the fee-for-service system over the next two to 10 years. But that would be the only way of doing it—rationalizing our way of paying for the medical services.

The present legislation encourages the tendency to develop high-quality services which was maybe one goal, but now unfortunately they are tending to encourage costly services in preference to lower cost alternatives which have not been eligible for this type of cost support. And we concentrate—this is really the very last remark I will make—because of

the way we have organized OHIP, on providing more costly, more expensive, more diverse, more unnecessary services than, in fact, is strictly necessary for good health care.

We will continue to do this if we persistently use this fee-for-service approach—if we persistently pander to the physicians, and if we do not rationalize and use a mailed fist with the physicians to control the costs. Hopefully in time we'll change it to a more rational system, which is to put the physician on salary.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: A couple of questions to the minister. The first one is: What financial juggling, Mr. Minister, has enabled you to put the estimates of the Medicare payments this year at the same figure as they were estimated for for last year?

The second question is somewhat different. I understand that the new administration of the combined hospital and medical care programme which was intended to speed things up and make them more efficient and so on, is now running as much as three months behind in paying claims out to doctors, and processing the information, and that right now it's experiencing undue computer problems due to the rapidity with which it was introduced.

Thirdly, there is a very serious problem with staff morale because of the decision made by the government without involving or even informing the staff of what's taking place, and because of the fact that some 300 to 400 staff are being declared redundant and are being phased out.

What assurances can the minister give that alternative employment will be found for this staff and what steps are you taking in order to ensure that the administration of the service is what it ought to be?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, first of all—

Mr. Cassidy: No speeches that time.

Hon. Mr. Potter: First of all, as you are aware, in amalgamating the two into one programme, it does entail a considerable amount more work and that has resulted in delay. But it's not a three-month delay. Actually it amounts to about two to three weeks at the most, in addition to what there was before, and this will gradually be picked up.

Mr. Cassidy: That is not what the minister's own staff says.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, whatever the minister's own staff says, that's the way it's going to be. They are just going to work that much harder and they are going to pick it up and count them within the next few months.

Mr. Lewis: You know, when you are uncomfortable about something you start to mumble.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I am not mumbling.

Mr. Lewis: You mumble into your mike.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You should be listening and you would be able to—Couldn't you hear me?

Mr. Cassidy: I was straining on your words.

Mr. Lewis: Stop chewing on your words like hot potatoes. Just spit them out.

Hon. Mr. Potter: As far as the extra staff are concerned, there is a normal turnover of approximately 10 per cent and this will gradually take care of itself. At the present time, we are absorbing as many of the staff as we can. Some are needed in setting up the new OHIP offices around the province and they have been transferred to these locations. We are not hiring any new people; as people leave they are just absorbed and they are filling these vacancies. At the same time, those who have opportunities to go some place else naturally are accepting these opportunities.

Mr. Cassidy: Is that an assurance that none of them will be fired?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's right, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2305 carried?

Mr. Cassidy: The third question hasn't been answered by the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh, I am sorry. What was that?

Mr. Cassidy: The question was, what juggling did you go to? Have you hidden some medical costs in other programmes? Why are the estimates no different between last year and this year?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, it was estimated that constraints, largely due to transferring from a fee-for-service basis to a programme

basis with a number of the clinics in the province, would result in a certain saving and that they would be able to operate on the same amount tht they had last year. That's the answer I was given by the department. I can't tell you any more than that. I wasn't here when the budget was made up.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to get an indication—I wrote the minister a letter; he hasn't got it yet, I'm sure—but I want to get an indication of the practice of making payments for illnesses incurred out of the country or for illnesses that require hospitalization outside the country for some reason or other.

My understanding, from a case that came to my attention over the last weekend, is that if a person voluntarily gets medical assistance out of the country, in New York State, for example, the programme will pay 90 per cent of the fee scheduled for hospital care—well, the minister can correct me when I get finished—and will pay up to the medical schedule for doctor care.

The case that I had brought to my attention was the case of a young lady who was visiting in Port Colborne and who I believe suffered a brain hæmorrhage. She was rushed from there to the Buffalo hospital, I believe, kept there for two or three weeks and finally sent back to Port Colborne and from there to Hamilton. I am a little worried that they have incurred rather large bills, and I want to know whether there is flexibility within the programme that will cover those kinds of costs, since they really didn't have anything to do with it. They didn't choose that she would go to Buffalo; they would have been happy to have had her taken to Toronto, for example, Hamilton or any other place, but apparently there is an arrangement between the Port Colborne General Hospital and the Buffalo hospital for matters of that kind. I wonder if the minister might explain to me how they might go about making the case more forcibly so that they won't be faced with such a large bill.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, it is not a question of making their case more forcibly. As the member is aware, the programme is designed to look after the residents of Ontario, and at the same time it looks after emergency care in other parts of the world at the same rates as they would be paid if they were sick in Ontario. In other words, they are paid on the basis of 90 per cent of the doctor's fee for the procedure if it had been performed in Ontario.

The hon. member is also aware that in many parts of the United States doctors' schedules of fees are a heck of a lot higher than they are in Ontario, but we don't pay the OMA schedule of fees, we pay the Ontario schedule of fees. As far as the hospital costs are concerned, the usual custom is that we pay the total hospital bill wherever it happens, but 90 per cent of the schedule of fees for the physician.

Mr. Deans: How do the doctors' fees compare between New York State, for example, and Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well that all depends. I had one case the other day where the surgical fee for a procedure in Ontario under the OMA tariff is $300, and in New York State the doctor's fee was $1,250. We pay 90 per cent of the $300. They have not drawn up a fee schedule for the doctors in the States. Down in Los Angeles, when I was there recently, it would be about twice as much as it is here.

Mr. Deans: They have a state-operated programme in New York State for medical coverage. Do they pay the full shot there or what do they pay? How do they calculate their schedule on it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't have any idea. I don't know anything about the American system.

Mr. Deans: Has there been any discussion between the jurisdictions to try to bring about some uniformity of schedules and fees, because you know as well as I do that people are, for example, sent from here to the Mayo clinic on occasion for surgical procedures. I had one in fact that the previous Minister of Health dealt with, where a boy was sent to the Mayo clinic as a result of some kind of growth in his arm. I am just wondering how we manage to overcome these rather large bills.

Hon. Mr. Potter: If it is an unusual circumstance for a condition that can't be performed here, then, of course, it is given special consideration; but if there is something that is in the fee schedule in Ontario, that's it. It is not changed.

Mr. Deans: There isn't any particularly special consideration given for the fact that the hospital itself undertook to do this, that she was in fact hospitalized in Ontario and that the hospital made the decision to move her from the hospital here to the hospital in New York state rather than to a hospital in Ontario that would fall within the jurisdiction of this province?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The hospital hasn't got any authority to transfer the patient, no.

Mr. Deans: I suspect in that moment of decision-making, the doctor perhaps moves the patients. But even if the doctor had said to the husband, "I have to take your wife to Buffalo to get her fixed," I doubt very much if that—

Mr. Stokes: Not "fixed."

Mr. Deans: All right, I will try again and do it a different way. Should I have said "repaired"?

I doubt if the husband would have questioned it at that point whether or not he would be stuck with the bill. It just strikes me as odd that there wouldn't be a way to deal with it when, in fact, the person didn't voluntarily go there. She was unconscious. She didn't ask to go there. She was taken out of this country to there. They are now stuck with rather large bills as a result.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2305 carried?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Just before you carry it, the minister said something which I felt was kind of astonishing. I just want to sort it out in my own mind. In reply to my colleague from Ottawa Centre who pointed out that the estimates for the Ontario health insurance programme for 1972-1973 are, in fact, $2 million less for OHIP this year than last year. It has been increasing at the rate of, I think, eight to 12 per cent a year or something in that vicinity for the last number of years—I am working by memory—but it is around eight or 10 per cent. This year it goes down.

The minister said that involved in the reduction was direct payment to some of the medical clinics. Can he be a little more particular about that? How are we in this year getting a saving from Ontario health insurance over last year given (a) the increased rise in health costs, and (b) the increased usage under the plan?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am not so happy with these answers.

Mr. Lewis: I congratulate you but I would like to know why.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The reason this was done was the individual in charge of this said that OHSIP at the time insisted that by introducing some new programmes, such as immunizing programmes, and by new funding arrangements with some clinics, this would represent the saving of $10 million I understand it hasn't been started. I doubt very much if it would have worked anyway.

By the same token, they were talking about the money that was going to be saved by the amalgamation of the three organizations, HIRB, OHSC and OHSIP, into one programme which would cut down by a saving of 863 people. As you are aware, many of these people have left, many of them haven't, but there certainly isn't going to be the amount of saving that was estimated there would be in the first place. But this is the reason I am given for leaving the estimates at that level.

Mr. Lewis: So the kind of sour grimace which characterizes your features as you sit down reflects your understanding that you will probably be in here for supplementary estimates at some point?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is understood. I wasn't happy with it.

Mr. Lewis: You weren't happy with it. Well, as I understand it, we can throw in another $10 million. I don't know how many more millions we can throw in for savings not yet felt by the amalgamation of the three services, but in any event the $527 million is clearly a fairly serious underestimate, if I understand that figure appropriately.

I am curious to know about the direct payments to the clinics. Are they giving you a list? Have they indicated to you at all where they thought they would make their savings on direct payments to clinics? I mean, some of the innocents on this side of the House have been arguing for some years that community medical clinics would cut costs substantially. But the $10 million is illusory, you say, you think, or it may be.

You know, you are the only minister who can laugh at a mistake of $10 million and get away with it. I should be aroused to

spittle at the edge of my mouth, but I find it very hard to get worked up. You just don't make a $10-million error in estimates and smile about it. You didn't have to increase the estimate. You could have taken the money from the brewers during the Treasurer's budget and spent this on your direct payments for clinics and made it work instead of underestimating the estimate.

I would be interested to know whether they have an estimate for you for the likely additional moneys that will be required due to the lack of absorption of staff by way of the amalgamation of the three services. Does the minister have an idea of that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I haven't.

Mr. Lewis: You don't?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I haven't.

Mr. Lewis: Well, how much of an overall saving did you anticipate as a result of the 840-odd?

Hon. Mr. Potter: There's no way I can give you an answer to that. I don't know. I will be honest with you.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Hansard can't record the gestures and agitation of the minister in the receipt of his material or in his inability to give the replies, but I can appreciate his dilemma. I just want to reinforce what others have said, that this is a ministry of $2 billion and just because it is $2 billion, one can't chuck $10 million to $25 million as though it didn't exist and we will be back in here on March 31 next rushing through supplementary estimates to make up for what we spent.

Mr. Deans: It will be in the fall.

Mr. Lewis: Will it be in the fall? Yes, we will probably come back for supplementary estimates in the fall to cover the Ontario Health Insurance Programme. Then I will tell you what will happen, Mr. Chairman: Everybody, the press and public will suddenly twig to it, because the House leader will stand in his place and say: "I have this list of supplementary estimates which I want approval for, and I am setting aside such-and-such a date for debate." He will do it before the orders of the day so that the entire press gallery, filled to bursting as it is now, will want to report it.

Then the public will believe that the Ontario Health Insurance Programme is accelerating and that health costs are again out of control and that this minister, like all his predecessors, couldn't put a cap on it, and that there was a mistake in estimates which by that time, I suspect, will be between $25 million and $50 million. That is what you are going to find you are ending up with, because all the previous years were in that percentage range increase, and there is no reason to believe it will be any different this year.

That's like undermining one's own programme in advance; that's inviting abuse six months hence that need never have been invited. It's a very shabby way to have estimates prepared for you, I am prepared to concede, and will do the programme no credence when it happens. There will be reaffirmation in everybody's mind that there is no way of containing health costs, and that is patently absurd.

May I ask you something quite off the subject, because I have to figure out yet how to cope with you? I am very serious. There is a way, I am absolutely certain, of coping with you. My colleague from Thunder Bay came very close the other night; he actually irritated you. I'm not sure whether to prick into some intemperate response is the way to engage you in battle, whether it is documenting the case in a way that can't be replied to—

Mr. Stokes: He says one has to be called obstreperous.

Mr. Lewis: —or just trying to match you in charm.

Mr. Chairman: The member is really getting off the subject.

Mr. Lewis: I am right on the estimates. I am expressing the frustration with my own mental health at the moment in dealing with this minister.

I am bringing my personal travail into the House. But we will find a way, I want you to know. This little excursion of quietude that you have had here for the last few days, it won't last very long; there will be a way.

Let me ask you something slightly off the subject that we have been discussing. Do you keep statistics in your department of the number of abortions and vasectomies performed in the hospitals of the Province of Ontario? Do you have such statistics and can they be made a matter of public record?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Not by hospitals, we don't. We have statistics on the number that

are done in the province, but we could get them by hospitals.

Mr. Lewis: Could you? I can seek that from you privately, as it were; I needn't occupy the time of the House. Do you have a figure for the last year or whatever?

Hon. Mr. Potter: In 1970-1971 there were 30,000 vasectomies.

Mr. Lewis: How many abortions?

Hon. Mr. Potter: You mean the legal ones?

Mr. Lewis: Yes. I presume those are the ones for which you have the figures.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Are we waiting for an answer—

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Reid: —or for the minister's advisers to wake up?

Hon. Mr. Potter: There were 16,224 abortions.

Mr. Lewis: That's 16,224 abortions in the year 1970-1971, which is the equivalent of the fiscal year. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is the last year we have got the figures for.

Mr. Lewis: Right, and 30,000 vasectomies. Is it your impression from your advisers seated around you, and from your own information, that the level of medical procedure in these fields is increasing steadily?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They tell me that it is beginning to decline again. It has reached its peak and is starting to slide off.

Mr. Lewis: Is that so? The level of legal abortions and legal vasectomies has started to decline in our province. Can we have an idea of when in time this occurred? This is kind of interesting.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't got it here now. They can't give it to me.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I take it that the peak was reached sometime in 1971 or early 1972 and has started to decline now.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's right.

Mr. Lewis: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 2305 carry?

Mr. Reid: Just before the vote carries, I want to say that earlier on I made certain comments in relation to the minister which could be taken to be complimentary. I would like at this time to retract those comments because the minister has not supplied us with the information that we have required. I want to tell him, as well as some other ministers, that as we get into the second, third and fourth years of his estimates, as well as others, that they won't have as pleasant a time as they have now.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2305 carried?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Just as the question comes to mind, could the minister tell me at what point will everyone in the province have his single OHIP hospital card?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They should have it now.

Mr. Gisborn: I had a case in the last three or four days—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, let us have it.

Mr. Gisborn: That would be an individual problem?

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2305 carried?

Vote 2305 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: That completes the Ministry of Health's estimates. We will now proceed with the Ministry of Education.

Mr. Lewis: Wouldn't you like to do some bills or something?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Not tonight.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, in presenting for the first time the estimates of the Ministry of Education I would like to begin by speaking in plain and concrete terms about some basic trends in Ontario education, and to give some specific examples of recent developments that are resulting in an improved quality of education in our elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I don't mean to interrupt the Minister of Education—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That is exactly what you have done.

Mr. Reid: —but I did; it is exactly what I want to bring to his attention as well as to

the House leader, who has disappeared for the moment, the fact that the Ministry of Colleges and Universities is down in committee. The two departments are closely related. I don't speak for the NDP but certainly in this party our critics—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The Liberals only have one speaker on the subject.

Mr. Reid: No, but it requires someone of lesser intelligence and sensitivity than I to speak for the NDP. But regardless, let's not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that the two departments are very closely interrelated. We are talking about education, the whole spectrum, if you will, of the elementary, the high schools, the colleges and universities. I say to you, Mr. Chairman—and I ask for a ruling on this—that it's most unfair and injudicious to bring the estimates of the Ministry of Education before this committee while at the same time the estimates of Colleges and Universities is continuing in the estimates committee downstairs.

In our party, and I had a nod at least from the other party, the critics are somewhat the same or related and I think that it is most unfair to us to bring this in at this time. To expect the people who are most responsible in our two respective parties to deliver a criticism of the department is most unfair.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, for a ruling on your part because I do not feel that one can separate the undergraduates, if you like, up to the high school level from the colleges and universities. I don't think you can disassociate the continuum of education.

I would ask for a ruling in this regard because I don't think it is fair. I think the Minister of Education is sitting there and sort of nodding—

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I am not!

Mr. Reid: It is hard to tell what the Minister of Education is doing sometimes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Rainy River has made his point of order but, however, I am not going to rule on the member's point of order.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, speaking on the point of order, I want to say that we all agree it would be preferable if the order of business could have been different from what it is. But we accept the situation that we are in. We will order the business when we're the government. We do have critics who are capable of handling both departments at the same time. Our critic will be here momentarily. He is in the Ministry of Colleges and Universities estimates committee. He'll be here momentarily and will be capable of dealing with this minister and this department without worrying about the overlapping.

Mr. Chairman: You asked for a chairman's ruling. It was already ruled in this House prior to recess and agreed upon that the Ministry of Education would go on right following the Ministry of Health. So the Minister of Education has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I said that as a starting point I would like to mention some of the effects and implications of the ceilings on educational expenditures which came into effect two years ago. In February and March of this year there was a resurgence of public discussion about the cost ceilings in some areas of the province at a time when certain school boards were in the throes of finalizing their budgets for 1972.

A great many claims were made at that time, Mr. Chairman, as to how the cost ceilings were going to have a deteriorating effect on the quality of education. However, once things settled down and 1972 school board budgets were finally set, it quickly became clear that none of the talk about drastic staff cuts or large increases in class size had materialized, nor had the speculation that the quality of education would deteriorate in Ontario schools. Most of these forecasts were largely based on misunderstanding and sometimes on exaggeration although I do not doubt the sincerity of the people who spoke on these matters at that time.

Much of the inaccuracy was based on an incorrect belief that spending on education in Ontario was being cut, which was simply not the case. The provincial cost ceilings only placed a limit on the amount by which a school board's budget could be increased each year.

We have not had budget cuts in Ontario education. We are aware of no boards that will have to spend less dollars per pupil in 1972 than they did in 1971. But, while school board budgets are still being increased, a successful effort has, and is being, made to control the size of the increases in response

to evidence from all sides that educational spending has reached a point where taxpayers will go no further.

Despite some isolated vocal evidence to the contrary, most school board trustees and administrators, privately and often publicly, acknowledge the need for constraints on educational spending. It is generally agreed among educators and educational officials that we can't keep on accelerating the rate of spending, first, because public financial resources can't keep up with it, and also because unlimited spending isn't needed to maintain or improve the quality of education.

I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, to understand the decisions as to how school boards plan their budgets have been left largely to the boards themselves. They have been free to determine the order and choice of their own priorities. Decisions to alter particular programmes or make other changes in order to meet budget limits have been decisions of the boards alone. It is also important, I think, to remember that the limits on total expenditures are not the same for every school board across the province.

Mr. Reid: Yes, they are.

Hon. Mr. Wells: An integral part of the ceilings is a series of special allowances called weighting factors which take special circumstances of individual boards into account—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): They are unrealistic in the north though.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —as well as regional differences. Extra assistance is provided to boards for exceptional circumstances related to compensatory and special education programmes. Extra assistance also applies to boards for such factors as commodity prices, differences in northern areas, additional maintenance for older schools, special needs arising from abnormal growth patterns or transfers and certain aspects of vocational education. School boards in larger cities, for example, have higher ceilings than small boards in order that they may cope with inner-city problems that are more prevalent in large urban areas.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, boards in the territorial districts have higher ceilings because of the higher costs of living in the north combined with the sparseness of population. A great deal of work has been done to ensure that the weighting factors are as fair and equitable as possible. Our goal is to ensure that proper consideration is given to school boards with excellent programmes or special projects that are benefiting children, or boards which have unique costs related to their geographic location or other factors beyond their control.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, the weighting factors were originally established only after exhaustive study of the spending patterns of almost every school board in the province and they are being constantly reviewed. Adjustments have been made, year by year, to recognize changing situations and we are spending much time, Mr. Chairman, analysing the weighting factors that will apply to boards for their 1973 budgets.

This review, Mr. Chairman, is essential to the continuing equity of the cost ceilings as they apply to individual boards. We have met with many boards in the past few months and have been in close touch with teacher and school trustee organizations. We are doing everything possible to ensure that the weighting factors are realistic and reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, when the cost ceilings were introduced for 1971, there were a number of school boards around this province which were spending more per pupil than the ceilings permitted, even after allowances were made by means of the weighting factors for special programmes and other legitimate factors which forced some boards to spend more than others on certain items. These boards which were above the ceilings have been given three years to bring their spending into line. The third year is 1973 so that when 1973 budgets are prepared, all school boards in the province will be required to stay within the weighted ceilings.

Now this exercise is going to be difficult indeed, Mr. Chairman, for some boards, particularly those which have not taken steps in the past two years to pave the way for the 1973 deadline. However, while acknowledging this difficulty which some boards may have, I wish to emphasize that the vast majority of school boards have done an excellent job of holding down spending increases and should be able to meet the ceilings in years to come without undue difficulty.

I would like to quote, Mr. Chairman, a paragraph from an article in a recent issue of the Newsletter of the Halton County Board of Education. In this article, Mr. William J. Priestner, chairman of the board's finance committee, reports to the people of Halton county on the fact that education taxes in the county will be dropping for the third consecutive year. Mr. Priestner said this in part:

> What about the government's ceilings that have been in the news lately? We have all heard complaints from school boards which can't get down to the spending limits imposed by the province. Your board has always operated under the ceilings and will do so again this year. We feel that the ceilings are necessary to control the extraordinary growth in education spending that we have witnessed in the last decade.

Mr. Chairman, good management and long-range planning have been demonstrated by many school boards in Ontario. There are many examples of boards which have planned wisely, sincerely and successfully and these boards have been able to pass on reasonable mill rates to their taxpayers and have not had to make alterations in their programmes that have had a detrimental effect on their children.

There are some people who would have us believe that the ceilings represent a great contradiction; that you cannot expect to see improvement in education while at the same time trying to slow down cost increases. Mr. Chairman, we have all been living under cost ceilings for the past two years now and I would say to you that there is no evidence that such a contradiction exists. In fact, the evidence to me suggests that there is definitely plenty of room for curriculum innovation and real improvement in the quality of education within the bounds of the budget limits that now exist.

Again, I would briefly quote Mr. Priestner of the Halton county board. He says:

> Sometimes when we get involved in financial matters, we tend to forget our real purpose and that is the kids. It is of little use to keep costs in control if the programme offered is suffering. This year's budget does not curtail any existing programmes and as an example allows more money for field trips.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that we are in a period of transition in education in Ontario. We are changing gears between a decade when the emphasis was on quantity, to a decade when the emphasis will be on quality. Naturally, the transition takes some getting used to, and the last year or two have been difficult, we acknowledge, for many school boards; but, Mr. Chairman, we must look on these few years as a period of adjustment. There is evidence all over the province that convinces me that we are on the verge of a visible move forward toward a greater emphasis on the quality of education.

Within the Ministry of Education, Mr. Chairman, we have been making major changes to reorganize our structure and make it possible for our people to be much more flexible and responsive in working with school boards and teachers. These changes have been much more than a mere shuffling on an organizational chart. When everyone settles in their new job assignments, there is no doubt that the staff of the Ministry of Education will be more efficient and effective in playing a leadership role and in responding to the needs of teachers and boards in terms of practical services and backup assistance.

We have been saying for quite a while that individual school boards, Mr. Chairman, must take much more responsibility for deciding what goes on in their schools. We have been saying that decisions about spending priorities, about the choice of programmes, about curriculum development, about personnel requirements, should be the business of the local school boards. We have been saying that the role of the ministry is increasingly a consultative role, providing practical advisory assistance in these matters, rather than dictatorial orders.

There has been a lot of misunderstanding about this, Mr. Chairman, and quite frankly, it has often seemed that people didn't believe us or else they actually preferred the old rigid system where there was little room for local flexibility and adaptability. However, there is an increasing number of boards and teachers around the province that have caught the spirit of what we are trying to do, and there are signs everywhere that the concept of local decision making is spreading.

A good example of this has been the realization by many teachers that they now have great opportunities to play a vital role in curriculum development in their schools. Teachers are beginning to realize that the Minister of Education really intends them to have the right and responsibility of developing their own courses, and of choosing their own textbooks and supplementary teaching aids, within the broad guidelines which we provide.

The basic textbooks, which may be used with any particular course, are listed in a document that we publish called Circular 14. As recently as about 10 years ago,

there was only one text list listed for each course. However, over the years, in a deliberate attempt to involve teachers in the selection of the text, a greater choice has been built in.

Today, for each curriculum subject, there are multiple choices as to which basic text may be used. This allows much more freedom for teachers in creating varied and interesting courses, using more than one basic text if they wish. In addition to the basic text for each course, there is also a wide range of supplemental books and materials, many of them inexpensive, which teachers may bring into the classroom to provide background or depth on particular aspects or portions of the course.

Mr. Chairman, teachers are free to choose these materials, subject, of course, to the budgets and general arrangements in each school. Mr. Chairman, over 3,000 supplemental materials of Canadian origin were recently compiled within the Ministry of Education in a document which we call Circular 15. This is the first major effort to compile a directory of learning materials in this country, prepared by Canadians for Canadians.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that, as Minister of Education, I firmly believe that our schools should be using textbooks and other materials written and produced by Canadians. Because of our belief in the need for the increasing responsibility of teachers to get actively involved in the selection of textbooks and supplemental aids, copies of Circular 14 and 15 were mailed to each teacher in this province and I considered it essential that this be done.

In a similar way, teachers today have a far greater role in curriculum development than in the past. The Ministry of Education no longer provides detailed course outlines specifying how a subject must be taught by every teacher to every student in the province. Instead, a booklet called a "curriculum guideline" is issued for each area of study. Each guideline explains the nature and scope of the subject, and makes suggestions for teaching it—and in doing so, outlines the boundaries for a variety of approaches that teachers might use in teaching the particular subject.

Mr. Chairman, in effect, each curriculum guideline is a skeleton to which teachers can add the flesh. Each is sufficiently flexible as to allow a school or a teacher considerable scope in deciding the specifics as to how the subject might best be taught in the particular school or particular community.

Mr. Chairman, this approach reflects better than any other example the Ministry of Education's emphasis on local decision-making geared to local needs or interests. In every community in Ontario, there is now a dramatic new opportunity to develop fresh approaches to curriculum, based on the needs and the interests of the students and the community.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are some who say that teachers are not ready to adapt to these changes. I do not accept this generalization. The nature of the curriculum guidelines is broad enough to allow teachers maximum flexibility in deciding how to teach their subjects. The guidelines are having a very positive effect in giving teachers a chance to use their own ingenuity, creativity and experience in the courses they teach. Mr. Chairman, I would say that in the province of Ontario there is certainly no ceiling on imagination, initiative and innovation.

It is a testimony to the initiative of teachers that over 2,000 innovative courses have been developed all over Ontario in the past two years. There are many hundreds of interesting examples, including a course in Ojibway on Manitoulin Island, a variety of courses that have focused on particular aspects of Canada and its people and special courses in family life education, and I could name many more.

And I think, Mr. Chaiman, it is testimony to the calibre of professional competence of teachers that of all such experimental courses submitted to the ministry for approval, about 90 per cent have been approved after careful review and study by curriculum officials of the ministry.

The significance of this new flexible approach to local curriculum development can best be appreciated if we look back 10 or 12 years when teaching meant using a prescribed textbook and covering a prescribed amount of material to pass prescribed exams.

In days past, it was sometimes said that the school curriculum was dull and irrelevant to the needs of students and a changing society. These new approaches which I have described have already gone a long way toward overcoming this situation. As an additional safeguard to keep courses of study relevant and contemporary, our ministry has begun a procedure that will ensure that all existing curriculum guidelines will be reviewed frequently and systematically.

The reactions and recommendations of teachers, pupils and parents are being sought. A representative "curriculum revision committee" is at work this year, Mr. Chairman, analysing primary and junior level programmes. This committee includes teachers, parents, principals and other representatives of all levels of education, and also includes representation based on geographic, ethnic and religious factors. This procedure is a virtual guarantee that no curriculum guideline will become static or outdated.

In addition to this, new curriculum guidelines for new courses are being continually developed as a need or widespread interest becomes apparent.

Now, let me give a few examples, Mr. Chairman. We've recently provided schools with guidelines for the new programme on urban studies, world religions, people in politics, and on law, and many schools may soon be offering courses developed from these guidelines. The world religions course will be offered in over 100 schools in the province, beginning next September.

The curriculum guideline on people and politics, which is just now being distributed, is a good example of how contemporary the classroom may become as teachers grasp their new flexibility and responsibility. Under this new guideline, teachers can develop courses that study Canadian nationalism and Canadian-American relations. Students can also study such issues as war, peace, law, authority, freedom, social justice, revolution, power and conflict.

Those of us who attended high school, Mr. Chairman, a decade—

Mr. Shulman: Better be careful what they teach them. They will turf you out if you keep it up.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, we are not worried about that.

Those of us who attended high school a decade or two ago may find it difficult to imagine such topics on the curriculum actually leading to credits for a secondary school graduation diploma. But, Mr. Chairman, who would disagree with today's young people being exposed to urgent and contemporary topics such as these?

These are just some of the very significant developments that have taken place regarding the curriculum in the schools of Ontario. Two major factors which determine the quality of education are clearly what is taught and how it is taught; and on both counts, Mr. Chairman, Ontario has been making great strides forward in the past few years.

However, there have also been a number of other developments in our schools which will directly affect the nature and quality of the educational experience to which the individual student is exposed. One I would specifically mention is the credit system, which will be operating in all secondary schools of this province this fall.

Basically, the credit system is based on the premise that it is impossible in this day of rapid change to rigidly specify a list of definite courses which will answer the need of each and every student in the province or, indeed, in any given school. Every student's needs are different; every student's interests are different; and every student's future plans are different, Mr. Chairman. Add to this the fact that society is changing very quickly and I believe you have a situation where flexibility in education is the only proper approach in preparing our young people for the world that they will face in the future.

The credit system provides this flexibility, while at the same time it ensures that students are equipped with a good grounding in basic skills and knowledge that will serve them well regardless of where their future leads them.

This system, Mr. Chairman, is an outgrowth of a project started in the mid-1960s in which a small group of secondary schools in the province tested-out and developed some basic approaches to flexibility in curriculum. About 80 per cent of Ontario's secondary schools are now at least nominally operating under the new system; and this September all secondary schools will be expected to adopt it.

Under the credit system there is no rigid "core curriculum" of subjects. In a fast-changing world it is impossible to predict in advance that any given core of basic subjects will provide the specific knowledge and skills that will be essential in the future.

However, all the courses that may be taught in a secondary school are divided into four categories, and the Ministry of Education requires that each student take a minimum number of courses from each of these four broad areas in order to ensure that he has a sound education base and well founded foundation. The four categories are:

1. Communications; which includes English, French and other languages.

2. Social and environmental studies; including subjects like history, geography, urban studies and law.

3. Pure and applied sciences; including mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics, and so on.

4. Arts; including such subjects as music and dramatic arts.

Beyond the requirements that students take a basic number of courses from each of these four areas, we believe that students should be free to choose their remaining courses themselves, in close consultation with their parents, teachers, and the school staff.

Needless to say, students intending to go to college or university must keep admission requirements in mind when selecting their secondary school courses. The same, Mr. Chairman, also applies to those who intend to seek a particular type of job after completing secondary school.

But the overall goal is to give each student a chance to take a wide range of courses that will test his ability and self-discipline and broaden his horizons considerably.

We have found that students, because they must now take an active part in decisions affecting themselves, are shifting from passive to active learning. In those schools where this new approach has been adopted enthusiastically by the principal and teachers, discipline problems have often been reduced considerably and the reasons seem to be that students are much more serious about their courses when they have actually had a hand in choosing them.

It is obvious that some secondary schools have capitalized on this new flexible approach more enthusiastically and successfully than others. There are still some principals, teachers and parents who apparently feel that students cannot or should not be left to choose their courses themselves, and that students will ignore some of the traditional basic subjects. But I would say that the evidence is to the contrary.

Here are some September 1971 statistics that I think are relevant. The number of students taking English at the grade 13 level jumped by 25.5 per cent. In history the increase was 12 per cent, and general science was on a par with the previous year. Grade 12 mathematics are 12.8 per cent gain. In general, there are significant increases in English, mathematics, technologies and some areas of science and art.

At the same time, there has been a growth in interdisciplinary work so that aspects of certain subjects such as history now appear in a number of other courses instead of only under the one old fixed label.

Now the figures we have from the schools for 1972 indicate that the so-called basic subjects are not being rejected by students, even though they now have more freedom to pursue learning experiences that relate either to modern issues or to their own particular interests. Because young people are not being blocked into predetermined and packaged programmes under the new system there are some other benefits worth noting. For example, many more students than before are now choosing one or two technical courses, for instance auto mechanics, because they now know that this does not commit them to a total technical programme. There has been a 46 per cent increase over last year in the personal typewriting course, since this option is now open to any student regardless of his career choice.

Before concluding may I take note of the fact that the high standard of special educational services developed in this province is being maintained within the financial resources now available to school boards. It is true that boards have had to take a close look at their programmes to make sure they are effective and to make sure they are not duplicating services provided by other agencies. But there is no indication that special education has suffered. As a matter of fact, most of the evidence suggests that school boards are becoming more involved with special education programmes than in the past. For example, new regulations come into effect next September making retarded children eligible to apply for full-time school attendance at the same age as any other child, with the right to attend school until the age of 21.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Excellent.

Hon. Mr. Wells: These changes will firmly establish that school law governing the basic rights of attendance applies in this province to all children. It is worth noting, I think, that between 25 and 30 school boards applied to introduce the new attendance regulation well ahead of the mandatory date of September 1, 1972.

Let me stress again that I firmly believe that Ontario is entering a decade when emphasis on the quality of education will be forceful and visible. In a recent survey, conducted by an independent research group for the Ministry of Education, about 1,000 parents in all parts of this province gave

their opinions on how they defined quality education, and about half of them zeroed in on the end product of the educational system as, of course, we would expect the student to do himself. They said quality education means students who show initiative, are able to reason, have practical skills, are well adjusted, and so on. The calibre of teaching was also mentioned frequently, as well as the need for courses that are practical, varied and interesting.

When asked what is the most important thing schools should teach, a sizable number of parents replied that schools should teach students to think on their own, or should stress skills of analysis and inquiry. When present directions and policies in Ontario education are evaluated against these objectives, it is very clear to me that our schools, which are already providing a quality of education that is virtually unmatched anywhere, are moving forward in ways that will serve our young people even better in the future.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Come on. Come on.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, it is significant to note that the vast majority of parents included in our survey registered a favourable impression of existing educational services in Ontario. Eighty-five per cent described themselves as moderately to very happy with the quality of education provided, and 70 per cent said that education has improved in the past five years.

I believe that this is a very positive base of public support upon which we can very aggressively move forward through the 1970s.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Minister, can I say you are making me sick?

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): He didn't make you sick; you are sick.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, before I move to adjourn the House, on Thursday we will deal with items 1, 2, 5, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 78; not necessarily in that order, but they are the matters that will be before the House. I would anticipate that the third readings will be first, of course.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 23, 1972

Estimates, Ministry of Health, Mr. Potter, concluded 2731

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells 2752

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2759

No. 70



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, May 25, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors with us today in the east gallery from Herron Valley Junior High School of Toronto, Briarwood Junior Vocational School of Hamilton and Romney Central School of Wheatley, and in the west gallery from Queen Mary Public School of Chatham and Glen Haven Senior Public School of Mississauga.

Statements by the ministry.

KINDERGARTEN TEACHING QUALIFICATIONS

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, with the decision to expand the junior kindergarten programme in Metropolitan Toronto, there has been considerable public discussion, both among educators and in the press, as to the qualifications that should be held by those assigned to teach within such a programme.

Junior kindergartens have been authorized as an optional part of the elementary school programme for many years. Where boards have taken advantage of the permissive legislation, fully qualified teachers have been assigned to these classes. Recently, because of the rapid expansion of nursery programmes and daycare centres, courses in early childhood education were established at colleges of applied arts and technology. It has now been suggested that persons with this form of training should be made eligible to teach in junior kindergartens operated by local school boards.

These factors, combined with the recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity that responsibility for daycare centres and nursery programmes should be transferred to the Ministry of Education, led the cabinet committee on social development to institute a thorough review of early childhood education and care in Ontario. This study, which is presently under way, will give guidance on the manner in which such activities might best be organized. In this work, arrangements will be made for consultation with the various organizations, groups and individuals who may have opinions on these matters.

The study will embrace the matter of qualifications of persons employed to work in junior kindergartens, daycare centres and nursery programmes. However, since the Ministry of Education has a particular interest in the qualifications of junior kindergarten teachers, and this matter is of current interest, I would like to indicate the steps that will be taken in this regard for the next school year.

I believe we have a need for much more objective evidence before we can come to firm decisions about appropriate procedures and arrangements. Specifically, we must have considerably more study to determine the qualifications and training that should be required of teachers in junior kindergartens—in order to ensure the best education, care and attention for the three- and four-year-old children who will be enrolled in these classes.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are not at this time altering the basic requirements expected of teachers assigned to junior kindergarten classes. However, I am going to use the discretion given to me under the provisions of the Ministry of Education Act to approve a limited number of experimental programmes using graduates of early childhood education courses as teachers of junior kindergartens.

In some of these programmes, I would also like to see parents and others involved as volunteers in the junior kindergarten programmes. To ensure this development, legislation has already been presented and brought forward to formally recognize the part which volunteers may play in the school setting.

The Ministry of Education will co-operate with any school board that seeks to undertake such an experimental programme in order to establish a companion research project that will permit an objective analysis of any differences that may arise as a result of the varying levels and kinds of training of those in charge in the junior kindergarten programme.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, such experimental projects should allow us to assess cost implications of the various approaches. I think it is clear that it cannot be automatically assumed that average costs based on present kindergarten and elementary school programmes should necessarily prevail for junior kindergartens as well.

I invite any school board which wishes to participate in this experimental programme to forward its submissions to me within the next month. Each will be given immediate attention.

We believe that this thorough and systematic approach will give us the insight required for sound final decisions—decisions that will truly reflect the needs of our young children, while at the same time recognizing our responsibilities to the citizens of this province.

INTRODUCTION OF CORONERS ACT, 1972

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I announce to the House that later on this afternoon I shall be introducing a bill intituled the Coroners Act, 1972.

The hon. members will recall that in 1971 there was a further excellent report tabled by the Law Reform Commission with respect of this matter, and I am pleased to announce that we have been virtually guided in toto by the principles enunciated by the report; and the vast bulk of the recommendations will have been put into effect.

The commission's report recommended that the office of coroner, now emanating out of the common law, be repealed and re-enacted in a form that would more accurately define and prescribe the workings of the modern Ontario coroner system.

The report recommended that a statutory system for coroners be established, with all the powers and duties of coroners spelled out. This, the report said, would ensure that the powers conferred on a coroner to conduct an inquest would not be construed as a court of criminal record.

In the Coroners Act, 1972, we are proposing such a statutory system which will serve to set out the basic duties of the coroner and clarify the rights of witnesses and others involved in inquests.

In these days of change, the constant factor is the evolution in the office of coroner. This evolution is the continuing concern by the public over preventable deaths; and in the interest of the public in protecting its members.

The commission's report outlined the fact that the role of the office must keep pace with the changes in society and with modern-day community needs and this we have put into effect.

The coroner's function today is still the principal means for instituting and carrying out public inquiries into circumstances surrounding sudden or unexplained deaths, and to enable the community to put into effect appropriate measures to forestall the recurrence, if that can be done.

The function of the coroner's office, Mr. Speaker, were outlined in the report as being threefold, and I think that they cover the full ground. They serve as a means of publicly ascertaining facts relating to deaths. They serve as a means to focus formally community attention on, and initiate community response to, preventable deaths; and they serve as a means to satisfy a community —and, I add, the parties interested—that the circumstances surrounding the death of one of its members will not go overlooked, concealed or ignored.

Mr. Speaker, in the past there have been occasions when testimony given at an inquest has resulted in unfortunate and unintentional imputations being attached to persons involved in the circumstances surrounding the death.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Unfortunate, yes, but the second qualifying adjective is questionable.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The provisions of the new bill, in fact, can be viewed as a bill of rights for witnesses and jurors and other persons who may be involved in a coroner's inquest.

In order that the rights of all persons are protected, there is a provision in the bill that persons appearing at an inquest are entitled to counsel.

In the event that an inquest is ordered into a death in which criminal charges have arisen, the bill provides that the person charged is not compelled to testify at the inquest. The nature of the verdicts which juries will be permitted to render in any particular case will be closely prescribed by the statute and regulations.

Mr. Singer: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Jurors will be permitted to make findings only of fact without

drawing any conclusions as to criminal or civil responsibility.

The Act also provides for the establishment of a coroners' council for the purpose of maintaining standards of performance among Ontario's coroners and to hear complaints about the work or conduct of a coroner. In addition there is provision for a code of ethics to be prescribed in the regulations.

The Act also makes provision for the development and employment of a system that fully exploits data processing facilities for the filing, retrieval and analysis of factual and statistical information arising from coroners' investigations and jury findings.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): They stopped doing that five years ago.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Such a data system will enhance the coroner system by allowing the office of the provincial chief coroner to function as a major provincial resource to ensure that experience gained from coroners' investigations is available to help control and eliminate preventable deaths in the future.

The Act also provides for the strengthening of the office of coroner. The legislation includes provisions that will decentralize the system through the appointment of area and regional coroners. These appointments will provide better supervision of investigations at local levels and ensure that the ministry is informed promptly and fully of ongoing activities in the field.

Although coroners will continue to be drawn exclusively from the medical field, the bill enables the appointment of a commissioner to preside over inquests in place of a coroner in any specific case which is of a particularly intricate and complicated nature in the scientific or legal sense.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that as the hon. members review these provisions they will agree that this legislation will be a landmark in its field and will give the Province of Ontario the most comprehensive legislation of its kind in Canada.

Nowhere has such care been taken to establish the rights of those involved or to delineate the responsibility and authority of a coroner as he fulfils his duties. We expect the Coroners Act, when passed by this Legislature, to become a model for other jurisdictions.

Mr. Singer: Are we going to get the regulations at the same time we get the Act?

METRIC CONVERSION

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Toursim): Mr. Speaker, in January, 1970, the federal government published a white paper on metric conversion. In this report, the government of Canada accepted the following basic principles:

The eventual adoption in Canadian usage of a single coherent measurement system based on metric units should be acknowledged as inevitable and in the national interest;

This single system should come to be used for all measurement purposes required under legislation, and generally be accepted for all measurement purposes;

Planning and preparation in the public and private sector should be encouraged in such a manner as to achieve the maximum benefits at minimum cost to the public, to industry, and to government at all levels.

The federal government has recently established the federal preparatory commission for metric conversion which will "initiate, co-ordinate and undertake investigations, surveys, and studies relating to the implications of conversion in different sectors of the Canadian economy." The commission will prepare for a national conversion programme so that conversion programmes in various sectors will be co-ordinated.

To assist the federal preparatory commission for metric conversion, the government of Ontario has surveyed all government ministries on the implications of converting to the metric system. As a result of this survey, the Ontario government has established a metric office in the standards, design and innovation Branch of the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. One of the functions of this office is to promote and co-ordinate the introduction of the metric system within the Ontario government. It will also be charged with the development of programmes and the co-ordination of metric studies within the Ontario public service. The timing of conversion programmes will be in step with that to be established by the federal preparatory commission.

Each ministry and agency of the Ontario government will establish an internal metric committee to develop and implement a conversion programme within its own jurisdiction. Each ministry will also contact the major associations and organizations with which they normally deal and open channels of communication on metric conversion.

Several industries have already moved in this direction. The pharmaceutical industry has converted entirely to this system. Our optical, photographic and electronic industries are partially oriented to the metric system. All hospitals in Ontario have converted to metric.

Several Canadian organizations and associations have expressed support for conversion. Among these are the Consumers' Association of Canada, the Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation, the Agricultural Institute of Canada, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers, and the Engineering Institute of Canada.

What will metric conversion mean to the average individual? Canadians will no longer purchase gasoline by the gallon and drive by the mile. Gasoline will be purchased in litres and road signs will be converted to kilometres. Speedometers on cars will be changed to kilometres per hour. The housewife will be buying butter by the gram, milk by the litre, and cooking on a stove with a centigrade thermometer. Even the family recipe book will be revised to show ingredients in grams and litres.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Good!

Hon. Mr. White: Retail packaging will undergo considerable changes and customers will be able to determine more readily—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): And the cost will be borne by the consumer.

Hon. Mr. White: —which products offer the most quantity for the lowest price.

At present 90 per cent of the world's population use the metric system as the predominant form of measurement. The majority of world trade occurs between metric countries. The countries of the European Common Market are long-established users of the metric system.

Both Britain and Japan, two of Canada's leading trading partners, are already embarked on a changeover. The United States, our principal customer, has completed a 2½ year study on the advantages of changeover. As a result of this study, the US Secretary of Commerce recently urged Congress to adopt the metric system over a 10-year period.

Adoption of the metric system is also desirable for Canada. Metric conversion will facilitate an increase in Canadian exports, thus creating more jobs for Canadians. Canadian industry will realize increased productivity due to the simplicity of the system.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The minister is really reaching.

Hon. Mr. White: Canada has committed itself to metric conversion. For its part, the government of Ontario lends its full support and co-operation to the Canadian government toward the adoption of the metric system of measurement in Canada and will provide a role of leadership to the people and economy of Ontario.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Great stuff.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That desk thumping there wasn't very spontaneous.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: That was not very spontaneous at all. You will have to speak to them over there.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Oral questions.

REFUSAL OF HOSPITAL PRIVILEGES

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health if he is prepared personally to undertake investigation into the circumstances under which Dr. J. E. Sheriton has once again been refused hospital privileges by the North York General Hospital Board—for eight years successively. If he is not prepared to undertake the investigation, is there anybody who can do this on behalf of the public and Dr. Sheriton, pending the possibility of legislation sometime in the future?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am at present preparing the new Public Hospitals Act which will be introduced within the next two to three weeks—I hope within two weeks—in which we are incorporating the recommendations of the Grange report. The review board will be established and that will hear this particular case.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Since the introduction of that legislation was predicted some weeks ago as well, would the minister not agree that an examination of this specific case might well be undertaken

by the minister himself in the public interest and in the interest of the rights of Dr. Sheriton?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is necessary because the bill will be in, the board will be established and I think that this should be handled by the board that is set up for this purpose.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, will the appeal board be empowered to inquire into retroactive actions of hospital boards, or will the appeal board's jurisdiction only extend from the effective date of the statute?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The appeal board will hear cases where appeals have already been sent in. At the present time there are two appeals and possibly a third that will be heard.

Mr. Singer: Well, by way of further supplementary, if there is no appeal procedure presently in existence in Ontario, why would anyone be sending in notices of appeal if they have got no one to appeal to?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Because they just want to be in on the first kick at the cat and they know that this is going to be set up.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That's certainly an interesting description of the appeal board we are establishing.

May I ask the minister whether Dr. Sheriton's evident basis for appeal to the board against the North York General Hospital is one of those which has now been submitted?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't had the submissions myself. I was in contact with the College of Physicians and Surgeons yesterday afternoon and they advise me that they had been made aware that there would be two appeals and probably a third. I haven't had the appeals.

Mr. Lewis: Well, by way of supplementary, given the public reporting of Dr. Sheriton's subsequent rejection, would not the minister personally attempt to initiate the appeal procedure or endeavour to see that his case comes before the board, regardless of the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is just what I am trying to do, get the legislation in so it can be done properly, and it will be done as quickly as we can.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Community and Social Services: Can he explain the administrative procedures in his department which would permit two senior civil servants of the government, one under his direction, having a personal interest in two homes for the care of disturbed children, when these gentlemen themselves have some of the administrative decisions to make as to the allocation of funds for this purpose?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I was made aware of this article in today's Star just prior to coming into the House. I would say that there are rather unusual circumstances and I would like to make a statement to this House in the very near future after I have gathered all the information.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: I wonder if the minister, while he is gathering the information, would examine the audit procedures that permitted these payments to be made?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, this will be included, Mr. Speaker. I have asked that all the financial and audit papers would be available to me so that I can make a full statement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

OHC WAITING LIST

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Revenue, but he knew it was coming anyway: Given the most recent report of the Ontario Housing Corp., can the minister indicate whether there are any plans to alleviate the six-month to 24-month waiting period which the OHC itself describes as the likely minimum for large families seeking accommodation in Ontario?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, of course we have plans and the plans are—

Mr. Lewis: What are they?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to build more public housing units and also to expand the programme for rent supplement.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, since we all know how long it takes to build a house, and there are 20,330 families now on this list in Metro alone, can the minister tell us whether the 600 additional units in rent subsidy this year are the maximum? Has he a programme that would go beyond that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The 600, of course, only applies to Metro, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and the federal government has agreed to share in the 1,100 across the province.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course we are also limited in respect of the amount of housing we can build, by the amount of participation the federal government is prepared to go along with.

Mr. Lewis: Why?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Why doesn't the province go it alone?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They don't give us unlimited funds.

Mr. Lewis: Why can't the minister do it himself?

An hon. member: Go it alone.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Limited funds. You need money for everything.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: He never uses his housing budget to the full.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, one of the problems is, of course, to get acceptance of public housing across Metro. The hon. member knows perfectly well that everyone agrees in general with the spirit of providing public housing, except that they want it in somebody else's district. I would suggest to the hon. member that it would be much more helpful instead of asking some of the nitpicking questions—

Mr. Lewis: Nitpicking? Twenty thousand families are nitpicking?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —if the hon. member or some of his colleagues appeared before some of the citizens' meetings, where they object to public housing in their district—if he or some of his colleagues would appear and stand up for the principle of public housing in those districts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: The only reason the government is in it is that it was pushed.

Mr. Lewis: That's right. The only reason it is in public housing is that it has been bullied into it by the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: It's ridiculous.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Which meetings has the minister been to?

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a further question, Mr. Speaker? Can the minister give some definition of what it takes to build up 40 points in order to wait only 18 months to find accommodation through Ontario housing? Why do you require that 40 points?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member has the explanation of our point system—

Mr. Lewis: No, I don't.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I can't explain it in detail by memory.

Mr. Renwick: The applicants don't understand it either.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are certain qualifications having to do with the size of the family, the financial position, the actual urgency in respect of getting other accommodation and so on. As I mentioned the other day, Mr. Speaker, no matter what the figures are of those people who are awaiting housing, they are not necessarily a true reflection of a dire need for housing.

Mr. Lewis: But if you have 40 points that is a true reflection!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because many people, of course, want to get into Ontario Housing Corp. projects because they are very good accommodation. And a lot of people want to improve their accommodation.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister agree that 40 points is urgent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member asked the question; let me answer it.

There is nothing wrong with attempting to improve yourself. However, our job is to see that the most needy and urgent cases are accommodated first. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the previous question, it doesn't mean either that they are waiting because it takes two years to put up a building, because there are literally hundreds of units at this very moment being finished.

Mr. Lewis: Right—and 20,000 families.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: The minister has just mentioned that the needy are the ones who are going to be accommodated first. How does he rationalize that with the fact that 82 per cent of the senior citizens in Windsor requesting housing have not been investigated? How does he know whether they are needy or not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because, Mr. Speaker, the first application has certain facts about the case, and of course there are a sufficient number of those for OHC to deal with in respect of the senior citizen building plans they have at any given time. I can assure the hon. member that the senior citizen programme has been expanded greatly; the number of senior citizen units this year will, I think, far exceed any other.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

NEW COMMUNITY OF NORTH PICKERING

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the provincial Treasurer: Can the provincial Treasurer estimate for the Legislature the cost to the province of providing what amounts to rent-free accommodation for those properties not expropriated but brought into the public sector in the vicinity of the intended Pickering airport?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think I could give an answer to that question, Mr. Speaker. One has to balance against that the costs of management. We think that the owners or tenants will stay and the property in effect will be better managed and better maintained at less cost to the province. That certainly has to be taken off whatever loss there might be in revenue. How you put price tags on either of those things, I don't know.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary? Doesn't the minister feel, in the spirit of the proceedings, that a commission of inquiry or an appropriate inquiry procedure should be established now that houses and properties are actually being acquired by government, whether through the expropriation route or this rent-free route?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I've indicated to the House before, Mr. Speaker, the first inquiries will probably take place under the federal expropriation of the airport site itself. We will participate fully in those, and I think that the demand for a public inquiry will be met at that time.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I understand it, the government is already beginning to acquire property now in that area? Does that not commit the government conclusively, in advance, without ever hearing what may emerge from an inquiry? Is that not prejudging it extraordinarily?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition was up.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the minister not agree that the hearings, of necessity, normally refer only to the use of a specific property for a project which has already been approved; and that it's going to require a specific decision agreed between the two levels of government that a special hearing, which, in fact, examines the necessity of the whole programme, will have to be established? Is that the correct interpretation, and would the minister take some initiative to see that such a hearing would be held at one level or the other before the properties are either purchased or expropriated?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the question which has been asked pertaining to the Expropriations Act, I think, would be more properly directed to my colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. Bales). I'm not a lawyer and I wouldn't attempt to answer that particular question. On the other hand, what must be pointed out is that, in terms of the questions which were just asked of my colleague, the Minister of Revenue, this government sees it as one of its responsibilities to get on with this job and not fiddle-faddle around forever.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce, a supplementary.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): A question of the same minister: Does the government know, or does the minister know, has anyone ever projected what this is going to cost the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: It's really not a supplementary, although the minister may answer if he desires.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The cost of purchasing the land has been estimated in the neighbourhood of $75 million. Beyond that, yes, we are doing projections of costs. It would be very difficult, for example, to determine the cost of services which would have had to be put in in any case on some scale or another specifically related to the north Pickering community as opposed to the airport. I'm thinking particularly of the south York sewer and water scheme which is being redesigned to serve both the airport and Cedarwood. That money, in my view, would have been spent in any case. How much of it, therefore, can be attributed to the community, as opposed to south York, is a good question. I can't, at this moment, give the member precise details.

Mr. Sargent: A further supplementary on that: I would assume then that on top of the acquisition cost, that the figures are unknown; that it is a blank cheque insofar as the Province of Ontario is concerned with regard to what it's going to cost. The Treasurer doesn't know the overall cost yet?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't suppose the overall cost will be known for a number of years.

Mr. Sargent: How can the government enter into a programme it doesn't know the cost of?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What this government is entering into is a programme to provide housing in this area for some 150,000 to 200,000 people. That's the important thing that we're doing, and not the nitpicking that the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: Who needs the airport in the first place?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Nitpicking my eye! Why don't you grow up?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Considering the increases to rents that are being applied by Ontario Housing right across the province at this time, what is the criterion for determining that the government is going to give rent-free accommodation to those people for two years?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think I have already explained that, Mr. Speaker. We think those people will be able to do a better job of managing the property, in effect, than we could do ourselves. I am quite aware that the member would like some sort of bureaucratic machinery set up, but we happen to take the interests of people into account first.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The government might provide some rent-free accommodation in Ontario Housing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Should we throw somebody out?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

STUDY OF PERFORMANCE LOAN PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism, Mr. Speaker? Has there been any study, at any time, of the performance loan programme in Ontario equivalent to the Harvard study of the federal DREE programme that is now public?

Hon. Mr. White: I am not aware of any formal study. In fact, I think it is impossible to determine accurately whether or not these incentives are productive. This is one of the reasons that during the estimates I posed the question to the Legislature whether or not we should be in the performance loan business at all.

The companies which come to ODC and to this department say, "If you give us a sum of money called a performance loan, we will locate this plant there." There is no way of proving before or after the fact whether this grant of money had a bearing on their decision to locate or not locate.

Mr. Lewis: Not according to Stanley Randall and the Minister of Revenue who told us conclusively those were the determining factors.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Revenue has the answers to questions previously asked.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That was a frank and honest answer.

Mr. Lewis: That was a frank answer but it makes one wonder what happened to the $40 million.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

PROVINCIAL ENUMERATION FOR ASSESSMENT PURPOSES

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on May 9 the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside asked, with regard to the provincial enumeration for assessment purposes, why we do not, as he put it, employ the unemployed or the wives of people who are not employed, in the enumeration rather than the wives of lawyers and others who do not need the money.

Mr. Singer: Especially wives of lawyers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To answer the question simply, Mr. Speaker, we do employ as enumerators unemployed persons, the wives of unemployed persons and a great many students, in fact those people whose hours are flexible enough to be able to make evening calls when necessary. Preference is given to individuals who have conducted this type of work for us in past years.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Including the unemployed wives of lawyers.

Mr. Speaker: The Ministry of Industry and Tourism has the answer to a question previously asked.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside with a supplementary.

Mr. Burr: Could the minister tell us what percentage of enumerators falls into those categories?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Speaker. That is what I mean by nitpicking questions.

Mr. Burr: Could the minister find out?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to commit myself to that. The hon. member has a question on the order paper in which he infers that some of the enumeration work has been wasted.

Now I wonder whether he wouldn't consider that what he is asking us to do at this present time might not be wasteful too? In other words, putting staff to work, going through all of the files, to find out what percentage of such-and-such a group has been employed. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I see no point in it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Industry and Tourism.

FORGIVABLE LOAN OBLIGATIONS

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I was asked several questions on Tuesday without being able to answer any of them so here we go.

Mr. MacDonald: What frankness!

Hon. Mr. White: First of all I would like to reply to a question by the member for Scarborough West who asked if I were aware that Mathews Conveyer Co. Ltd., Port Hope, is unable to meet its obligations under a forgivable loan granted in 1968 because of a contract award taken by the parent company in Pennsylvania.

The member is likely referring to the contract for the Galleao International Airport at Rio de Janeiro. The Brazilian authorities decided to purchase their equipment requirements under a single purchase order and a single loan offered by a supplier nation. The value of all of the equipment to be installed was $18 million to $20 million. Only two countries tendered on the entire equipment requirement, France and the United States. The USA was selected as the supplier nation by Brazil. Canada bid on only 20 to 25 per cent of the products needed.

Both Mathews Conveyer Co. Ltd. of Port Hope, Ont., and its associate company, Mathews Conveyer Co. of Ellwood City, Pa., submitted quotations on baggage-handling equipment totalling about $1 million. The US company obtained the baggage-handling order because the total equipment order was obtained by suppliers from the United States under United States financing arrangements.

Mathews Conveyer of Port Hope was granted a performance loan in February 1968 of $193,000 of which $158,000 was disbursed. The company manufactures industrial

and commercial conveyor equipment. Employment in the plant at the time of the loan was 322. Employment was forecast to increase by 140 over five years. The number of extra jobs contemplated comprised not only those permanently at Port Hope but also those to be employed on contracts at various points in Canada. At the present time permanent employment at Port Hope amounts to 232 with another 80 people employed at installation locations. The fall-off in employment is the result of market conditions.

Mr. Lewis: What does that do to the performance loan?

Hon. Mr. White: They don't get the credit until they earn it.

Mr. Lewis: But they have had $158,000 disbursed.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, but the forgiveness portion isn't credited to the account until it is in fact earned by the increase in employment, so the entire indebtedness will be standing on their account. That is my understanding.

Mr. Lewis: Good. I understand.

FRENCH VERSION OF ONTARIO THEME SONG

Hon. Mr. White: There was a question asked by the member for Ottawa East, as to whether it would be proper to have a French version of the Ontario Place theme song.

It is correct that only the English version of this composition is available. The theme was originally commissioned for use as background music for the various exhibits and for promotional purposes. It is now available in record form and distributed by Quality Records in English only. There has been no apparent demand for a French version, and to release this in French would entail heavy production costs. However, if the hon. member could indicate a demand for a French version I believe we would be prepared to consider appropriate action.

The hon. members may be interested to know that our pod exhibits are in both languages.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, can I have a supplementary? Mr. Minister, how can you expect demand if it is not available? I would like to put on the record right now that there is a demand for at least one copy, and possibly for half-a-million copies if it was available.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): But you are in the minority.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think I would like it if the new board of directors did consider that particular request, and I will ensure that they have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the minister, surely he does not think it would be a very expensive proposition just to have a translation of this song?

Hon. Mr. White: No, that would not be expensive at all. The question is how extensive might the new rendition be, which involves no doubt having French singers and completely new production costs. However I would be glad to—

Mr. Lewis: The minister shouldn't worry about the expense. Instead of hiring a new emergency measures officer to deal with imminent war, he can put out a French version.

Hon. Mr. White: I rather like the idea.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is very disarming today. What is wrong with him?

ONTARIO PLACE LIQUOR LICENCES

Hon. Mr. White: The member for High Park asked a question, namely: "Can the minister advise me, when he turned the food concessions at Ontario Place over to private enterprise, if an application was made to the Liquor Licence Board for permission to handle those particular licences by the new people?" The answer is, the Ports of Call do not hold these liquor licences. The licences issued by the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario for the Pod 2 restuarant complex and lounge plus the banqueting facility in Pod 1 remain in the name of the government of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, like the Jockey Club, it is just holding them.

Hon. Mr. White: The arrangement lease with Ports of Call is a management responsibility only. The applicant for the original licence on Feb. 16, 1971, was Her Majesty in right of Ontario as represented by one of the ministers of the Crown, namely the Minister of Trade and Development. At the time of application for the original licence, the present Minister of Revenue was the minister responsible.

Hon. Mr. White: As required by the Liquor License Board of Ontario, these licences were duly renewed for the 1972-1973 season and the applicant for renewal was Her Majesty in right of Ontario represented by one of the ministers of the Crown, namely the Minister of Trade and Development. At the time of the application for renewal of the two licences I was the appropriate minister. The Liquor Licence Board licences currently held are: dining room-lounge licence 8869, (serial 1447); lounge licence 8869, (serial 3882). As required by the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario, the above-noted licences are on display at Ontario Place in the Island Ports restaurants.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it then correct that any person who has a liquor licence in this province may assign the rights under that licence to some other person who may or may not be known to the Liquor Control Board—Liquor Licence Board, rather?

Hon. Mr. White: It is still a matter of assignment I think, Mr. Speaker, to be technically correct. I suppose you can hire a new manager any time you want to. If I may point to the practical aspect of this, we did for some number of months last year engage the George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology to run these restaurants. I was the Minister of Colleges and Universities at the time, and I thought it was an excellent idea. It proved to be less than perfectly successful with the result that we ourselves attempted to run the pod restaurants, and that likewise was less than perfectly successful.

Mr. Lewis: Yes; well that was predictable.

Hon. Mr. White: So now we are trying a third approach which we are very optimistic about and I think—

Mr. Lewis: With the gourmet tastes experienced in the members' dining room, the government can hardly be expected to run Ontario Place.

Hon. Mr. White: —it must be recognized that in having a series of managers, it is expeditious to have the licences in the name of the owner.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Ask J. J. Dineley.

Hon. Mr. White: Which I assume is available to other licence holders.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementaries?

I should point out to the hon. members that there are other ministers who also have answers to questions previously asked. If it is the wish of the members we will have those answers now, otherwise we will commence with the alternative questions.

Mr. Reid: They can relax.

Mr. Speaker: Alternative questions?

The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, my minister just disappeared. I wish he would do it on a permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Treasurer. Would the Treasurer undertake to make available to all members of this House copies of the report of the federal Auditor General, Mr. Maxwell Henderson, so that we could have some idea of what the report of the government auditor, properly prepared, looks like.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is a copy available, or will be, in the legislative library.

Mr. Reid: Send one to the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sure Trudeau would gladly send him one.

HAMILTON HARBOUR LANDFILL

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs: Is it the intention of the Ontario government to support the city of Hamilton's position that they ought to have jurisdiction over any water lots filled by the Hamilton Harbour Commission, for purposes of zoning?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can't say that has been a matter which has been considered by me or, to my knowledge, by the government. No doubt it will be taken into account.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ontario South.

POLLUTION ON FARMS

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I would like to ask the minister if he could give us his opinion on a recent US Supreme Court decision on air pollution as it affected Spur Industries, which is a large feedlot in Arizona; and what effect this would have on a similar situation in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: What was the decision?

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Right at the tip of his fingertips.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question put by the member for Ontario South—

Mr. Sargent: Is that the way the member rehearsed it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —the report which I read of the supreme court decision has reversed a position earlier taken in a United States court, where the residents of Sun City in Arizona had sued Spur Industries, which operated a 42,000-head feedlot in the State of Arizona, for air pollution.

The decision went against the Spur feedlot and it was required to move. But the appeal was made to the Supreme Court who, I understand, modified the decision. While they have suggested that the feedlot may have to be moved, those who have brought the action against the feedlot will have to pay the entire cost of moving that feedlot and all its facilities and supplies included—

Mr. Deans: That is a real victory, isn't it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —which will amount to several millions of dollars. In reply to the part of the question in which my hon. friend asks what application does this have in Canada: It seems to me that since this problem of air pollution associated with the livestock industry of this province and, in fact, our agricultural economy is really based on the livestock industry of this province, it can have very far-reaching effects in this matter of air pollution and what we do about it. This doesn't for a moment suggest that we, as agricultural producers, or people interested in the livestock industry, should not pay adequate attention to our—

Mr. Stokes: The sweet smell of prosperity.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —responsibilities as far as controlling this as far as possible. But I think it does place emphasis on the fact that if we are going to have a livestock economy, a certain degree of smell is going to be associated with it and we had better learn to live with it.

I think we have to take a very responsible approach to this matter. I'm pleased to see that the Supreme Court decision has made it possible for a farmer, or for a livestock producer, to say that when his business is established in an area but people decide to move into that area and establish residential quarters, that it is not his responsibility to go out of business at his expense. I think that is the important thing.

Mr. Gaunt: Right.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary question, applying all of this to the Niagara-on-the-Lake situation that I raised with the minister last week: Has the minister considered laying down some guidelines which may have to be merely suggestive for municipal action by way of bylaw, so that you can cope with those whom everybody acknowledges are creating the problem instead of letting it go to a point where all farmers are penalized?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the hon. member for York South raises an interesting question, Mr. Speaker. The municipalities now have the right to implement that kind of legislation; some of them have acted in this regard. I think the attempt that was made in the Niagara Peninsula, although I am not familiar with the detail of the bylaw—all I am saying is what I saw in, I believe, "Farm and Country"—would indicate they are taking pretty positive action.

I understand from things I have heard about what is going on out there that there is a modified approach being taken to this already, and that those who may have been blamed rightly or wrongly for generating the problem in the first place have taken effective action to refrain from abusing the privilege—maybe that's not the right word, but that's the word I find appropriate—and perhaps the bylaw may not go into effect just as it was intended. In any event, it has to go before the Municipal Board.

My colleague who is not in the House today, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), and I have discussed this matter. We are concerned, but by the same token we are not too sure how one should approach it. If we introduce legislation, then it has to have application to all municipalities, and I

don't think my hon. friend or anyone else in this House really expects or wants that to happen.

Mr. MacDonald: We don't want to punish the innocent along with the guilty.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That's right, but by the same token we are concerned and we have approached some of those who had been perhaps abusing the privilege and suggested to them that there are ways and means—by following the code of practice and suggested guidelines—that they could clean up that situation and let us live with it.

I think that the Supreme Court decision mentioned by my hon. friend from Ontario South a moment ago and the decision, which I believe was made in the State of Michigan this week, in a case having to do with a hog feeding enterprise, may have a salutary effect on some of these problems, which to my mind have grown out of all proportion in rural Ontario and indeed throughout rural Canada.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That will shake the rats out of the rafters.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

ARNPRIOR DAM

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I had a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch). He left, then the Minister of Education left, so I think I will ask the question of the other thinker in the cabinet, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence).

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Put the question. The member just likes to hear himself.

Mr. Roy: In view of the provincial secretary's statement last week that he would have an answer for us on the dam on the Madawaska River at Amprior within a few days, is he in a position to tell us now whether the government is going to build it or not now?

Mr. Yakabuski: We'll look after that. The member should look after the mess at St. Louis-Marie de-Montford Hospital.

Mr. Roy: The member is not looking after anything back there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Don Mills.

FIRE IN OHC BUILDING

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): Mr. Speaker, I have a series of questions of the Minister of Revenue, all to do with the fire last Friday morning at 8:30 at 90 Parma Court, an OHC building. First, is the minister aware of this fire, which destroyed apartment 714? Second, is he aware that the maintenance staff of Ontario Housing Corp. had turned off the water supply to all fire hoses in that building and therefore these were unavailable for use to extinguish the fire? Third, is the minister's staff investigating ways and means of assisting the families put out by this fire and of compensating them for their damage and the damage to apartments of neighbours?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for bringing that to my attention. I was not aware that there was a fire. I will certainly look into it and find out what is being done.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

LIST OF PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. When might I reasonably expect an answer to the question on the notice paper regarding names and addresses of private investigators? It has been with him for seven or eight weeks, and I wrote to him some three or four weeks ago with respect to it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that is well on its way through the mill. As the hon. member can appreciate, it is a very lengthy answer; there are a great many details. I will check into it. I would have thought that the answer was already forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

AUTOMOBILE PRICES

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations were to move over just one, I could put a question to him. Is the minister aware that under the Ontario Regulation 98-71, in regard to the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act, one of the regulations requires automobile sales people to list the manufacturer's suggested retail price to the buyer of the car? Does he

not feel that particularly in those areas outside of Metropolitan Toronto in northern and northeastern Ontario, where the dealer has to bring the car a great way, it discriminates against the local dealer in this regard because the buyer feels that he is making an undue profit in the difference between the manufacturer's suggested price and the actual selling price?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for discussing the matter with me so that I could supply him with a detailed answer.

Since the implementation of the auto trade pact, with the transfer of new vehicles from Canada to the United States and vice versa, all vehicles, whether produced in the United States or Canada, carry a sticker in compliance with the Automobile Price Disclosure Act. This sets out the manufacturer's suggested retail list price, together with the itemized price of all optional extras on the vehicle and also discloses the freight charges.

There is no comparable legislation in Canada requiring that this sticker remain on the vehicle, therefore it is left to the individual dealer in Ontario to determine whether this is removed before the vehicle is shown to the public. Furthermore, as the sale of automobiles is invariably a matter of negotiation, particularly on price, such disclosure does not necessarily inhibit a particular dealer, for the important factor is the net price at which the vehicle is sold. He must necessarily remain competitive in the particular area in which he trades.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

UNION SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister looked into the looting of the treasury of Union Savings and Loan Association in the Bahamas and specifically the role of a Toronto lawyer, R. G. Alexander, in that particular affair?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I didn't get the beginning of the question.

Mr. Shulman: I said: Has the minister looked into the looting of the treasury of Union Savings and Loan Association?

Mr. Lewis: A very bad name.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I haven't, but I'll take the question as notice and supply an answer.

Mr. Renwick: Why don't you go down there?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I might—without money.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

FIRE REGULATIONS FOR TREATMENT CENTRES

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Solicitor General. When does the minister propose to change the fire regulations for family type home treatment centres for the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed, so that they require no special fire protection features beyond that of a normal home, as has been requested I understand by the Minister of Health?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't know whether I have the grasp of the full question, Mr. Speaker. I can advise the hon. member that the matter of the fire inspection of all facilities provided by the government is under review at this time. I would be very pleased to check into the matter, although I think I'll read Hansard and find out what the hon. member was interested in.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Don Mills.

Mr. Cassidy: It is your understanding that is at fault not—

CLAIMS AGAINST OHIP FOR BLOOD TESTS

Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. I would like to ask the minister if he is aware of the existence of a firm in Rexdale, known as Thistletown Medical Laboratories, which is approaching local industry offering to give free blood tests to their employees and is then submitting these tests for payment by OHIP, and is in fact receiving payment.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I am not, Mr. Speaker, but I would be delighted to have the information on that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

ONTARIO PLACE UNIFORMS

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism: I would like to know why he found it necessary to redesign the hostess uniforms at Ontario Place after only one year with the old design; and secondly, how much did the designer Marilyn Brooks receive as a fee for design of the uniform; and what connection to Ontario would the motif of happy, smiling hippos have?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: It represents the government!

Hon. Mr. White: I just assume that we have to have smart-looking new uniforms every season. Those were worn 144 times and they were tailored to some extent to the young men and women who provide that service, so I think—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Ask your wife how she likes to wear the same dress 144 times.

Hon. Mr. White: —it's not unreasonable to have a new outfit every year. I will find out from my officials the amount of money paid to the designer. The happy hippo theme had not actually—

Mr. Lewis: Caught on yet?

Hon. Mr. White: —had not actually come through to me, I must confess—

Mr. Lewis: But doesn't the minister read Arthur Harnett's ludicrous press releases?

Hon. Mr. White: I suppose it's—

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister seen that one?

Hon. Mr. White: I suppose it is some kind of reverberation through the decades from the trade theme of Bob Macaulay, which was, if you need a hippopotamus, import one; otherwise buy Canadian.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean that the shadow of Bob Macaulay still looms over the cabinet?

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Potter presented the report of the Ontario Health Services Insurance Plan for the period ending March 31, 1971.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to congratulate the minister for presenting his report comfortably after his estimates have ended.

Hon. Mr. Potter also presented the report of the Ontario Cancer Institute for the period ending March 31, 1971.

Mr. Clement, from the standing administration of justice committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 105, An Act to provide for Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Deans: No, Mr. Speaker, we would prefer the bill would go to the committee of the whole House.

Mr. Speaker: Those in favour of the bill going to third reading will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it requires unanimous consent for it to go to third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that is in connection with the report—I beg your pardon. It should have been—

Mr. Lewis: Practice and procedure.

Mr. Speaker: That's right. In the event of the lack of unanimous consent, that is quite correct. I apologize.

Mr. Lewis: But you will notice the way the government tried to sneak it through.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I was just snoozing a little. The bill will go to the committee of the whole House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: It certainly will. We are waiting to do battle with the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. MacNaughton).

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF YORK ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Regional Municipality of York Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, in line with the amendments to the Niagara Act and other Acts which have been considered by the House, these are to be regarded as housekeeping amendments.

RAISING MONEY ON CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Hon Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Reid: The Treasurer could get more on the credit of the Conservative Party.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We could get a lot more on the credit of the Conservative Party than you are ever going to get on the credit of that bankrupt lot.

Mr. Reid: I understand we won't lend you one.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another $800 million!

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): Big province.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this is the normal bill which is introduced to the House to authorize our borrowings from the public sector and more particularly from the Canada Pension Fund.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

CORONERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves first reading of bill intituled, the Coroners Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: It's pretty exciting, finally introducing a bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That one is.

Mr. Shulman: It took him five years.

An hon. member: I'll tell you, that is a good one for anybody to introduce.

An hon. member: Let's have a long gestation period.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, in the beginning, I made a statement outlining the details of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would you mind repeating it?

Mr. Deacon: Give it to us again. It was great.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Hon. Mr. Potter moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing amendments to the Public Health Act that provide for the licensing of all medical laboratories in Ontario.

As the members will recall, the Committee on the Healing Arts and the Ontario Council of Health recommended that licensing and inspection systems for medical laboratories be developed. I believe these measures will be welcomed by health professionals and the public alike, since they will be assured of a high quality of service in this vital area and we can make the best possible use of our resources.

In this amendment, the Ministry of Health proposes to license all medical laboratories in Ontario where tests on specimens taken from the human body are performed to obtain information for diagnosis, prophylaxis or treatment. This will include hospital, public health and private laboratories. Laboratories will be licensed only to perform specific tests for which their staff is qualified and for which the laboratory has suitable facilities and equipment. New licences will be granted only if there is a public need.

There are appropriate provisions for appeals consistent with the statutory Power of Procedures Act and provision is made for the establishment of a laboratory review board.

The Act also provides for the development of new systems of payment for the expenditures of laboratories. We expect that in future such systems can be developed to provide savings in this part of our health service system.

I might advise the members that the regulations under this Act have been prepared and will be forwarded to the Lieutenant Governor in Council for approval as soon as the bill has received third reading. We anticipate that this programme will come into effect as of July 1, 1972.

In addition, there are several other amendments contained in the bill, required as a result of the transfer of responsibilities from the Ministry of Health to the Ministry of the Environment, bringing the Public Health Act up to date with respect to these changes.

PHARMACY ACT

Hon. Mr. Potter moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Pharmacy Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The bill I present today, the Pharmacy Amendment Act, 1972. will authorize pharmacists to substitute less costly equivalent preparations for those prescribed by physicians within the limits and in the manner set out in the bill.

The members will be aware that this is a question that has been of some concern to us in our attempts to try to lower the cost of prescription drugs in Ontario. The Parcost programme, introduced in 1970, was designed to assure the public that they could obtain prescribed pharmaceutical products of quality at reasonable cost.

In conjunction with this programme, our drug quality and therapeutics committee has assessed the quality and therapeutic value of all pharmaceuticals in the Parcost index. We are now satisfied that product selection can be done safely and in the public interest. In the most recent edition of the Parcost index we are confident that, except where indicated otherwise, products listed in the same charts are therapeutically interchangeable.

This proposal has been developed after thorough discussion with the Ontario Pharmacists Association, the Ontario Medical Association and the College of Pharmacy. When this proposal comes into effect, a pharmacist will be able to substitute the lowest-cost interchangeable pharmaceutical product in his inventory for the drug prescribed. At the same time, the physician will be protected in that he may indicate that no product selection should take place on a specified prescription.

New requirements have been included respecting the information that must be noted on the prescription, including the price charged. The name of the drug must also be marked on the container received by the patient.

We expect that these provisions will stimulate pharmacists to use product selection and enable them to reduce their inventory and operating costs. The public will have an opportunity to do comparative shopping on prescriptions, which will make possible additional savings over and above product selection in any one pharmacy.

We are confident that these measures will be a major step toward achieving our objective of lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

Regulations are being drawn up which will require the use of "child-resistant" containers by pharmacists, unless otherwise requested—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury): At long last.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —by the prescriber or the customer, when filling prescriptions and which we hope will reduce the possibility of accidental poisoning among our children.

In order that pharmacists will know which prescription containers qualify as "child-resistant," it is proposed that an independent testing organization such as the Canadian Standards Association will authorize the use of its seal on containers that meet an agreed standard. We will propose that the regulations pertaining to this come into effect on Jan. 1, 1973, in order that appropriate time is permitted for the changeover by manufacturers and pharmacists.

Mr. Lewis: That is known as "the Deans amendment."

MEAT INSPECTION ACT, ONTARIO

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Meat Inspection Act, Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to provide that the inspectors of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food will provide the inspection service for meat processing in the plants that are now inspected by the inspectors of another ministry. Previously, there had been inspectors from the Ministry of Health, and it

looked like a duplication of effort to have inspectors going out from various ministries of the government. An arrangement has been worked out mutually between the two departments, where our department will now provide the inspection service. And that's what this bill does.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

SONIC BOOM INVESTIGATION AND CONTROL ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to regulate the Operation of Aircraft over Ontario and to investigate the Effect and Consequence of Sonic Booms.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 109, An Act to control Pyramid Methods for the Distribution and Sale of Commodities.

Bill 117, An Act to amend the Children's Institutions Act.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves second reading of Bill 124, An Act to amend the Ministry of Education Act.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on this bill and see if I can elicit some comments from the minister himself. The bill apparently does have a—

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might say that in case any member is wondering about our intentions, I intend that this bill go to the social development committee. I realize these bills are all very detailed; that each section is about something different, and I do intend that it go to the social development committee.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, then I will curtail my remarks as a result of that.

One of the areas that does disturb me, Mr. Speaker, is section 3, subsection 2(a) of the bill, regarding the assignment of a letter of approval to a board of education. With the surplus of secondary school teachers and school teachers in general, I just wonder why such a letter of approval is necessary. Surely we should be able to get sufficient teaching talent among those who have not been able to find employment.

Another section that I think is a backward step, Mr. Speaker, is section 4, which transfers programmes of recreation, camping, physical education and adult education from the Department of Education to the Department of Community and Social Services.

I thought that the Department of Education had a fairly good liaison with the recreation directors throughout the province; everything seemed to be working fairly well. Now, all of a sudden, that happy relationship is going to be severed and the recreation directors will be responsible to a completely new ministry, the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

I thought that the department should have carried on; it has developed a certain approach, a certain amount of co-operation, and I am afraid that with the transfer a lot of the good work that has taken place between recreation directors and the ministry may be lost.

That is the extent of my comments, Mr. Speaker. I'll make more comments when the bill comes before the committee.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to this bill before it goes to the standing committee.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that between now and the time the bill goes to standing committee, the minister ascertain the effect that this will have in school boards in unorganized territories, having the equalization factor now given by the minister instead of the Department of Municipal Affairs. The equalization factor is a very critical matter when it comes to the grants that are made available to the school boards. A small variation up or down can be most important to the taxpayers of that area as it diminishes or increases a school grant.

My understanding is that when the factor was figured out by the Department of Municipal Affairs there was an appeal process available for the school board to appeal the equalization factor. This function is now being transferred from the Department of Municipal Affairs to the minister, who will supply the factor which in turn is used to ascertain the grant formula. Perhaps the minister would reply as to whether or not there

is an appeal process available when the factor is presented to the school board for grant purposes?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the minister is referring the series of bills, I understand, to the social development committee, because most of the comments that I have to make on them are clause-by-clause comments.

I would, however, like to give the minister notice of one area that concerns me, with regard to sectioin 2 of Bill 124. I am very worried that this section in fact makes the listing of textbooks more authoritarian than it has been in the last few years, where we have seen a loosening up and a more direct contribution by teachers, department heads and principals in addition to what are required textbooks. I raise the question because it seems to me that section 2 limits the flexibility, particularly in subjects such as history and English, when that is combined—and I have to make reference here to another bill—with section 13 of Bill 128.

I don't want to hold the bill up unduly at this stage if we are going to get a thorough discussion of that and an explanation of that in the committee. I would feel much happier if the clause read, "cause to be published from time to time lists of suggested textbooks" rather than the way it is presently worded.

Mr. Speaker: Any other member wish to speak to the bill at this point? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, in replying to some of these general comments that have been made at this time, first I would say that the section concerning letters of approval in no way indicates that we approve of letters of approval. This is merely to regularize a procedure which has been going on. Up until now, under the legislation it has really only been possible to legally issue letters of permission, which as the hon. member knows are issued both for teachers who don't have the basic teaching certification and for teachers who have basic teacher certification but need permission to teach subjects for which they don't have particular certification.

These letters of approval are for the latter category—those teachers who have teaching certification but in a high school perhaps haven't got the necessary qualifications to teach typing, but a principal wants them to teach typing, so in that case we want to issue a letter of approval. I would certainly agree with the hon. member that I think in the years that we are moving into, the issuance of letters of permission and probably letters of approval will certainly diminish; there is certainly no question about that.

The matter of transferring of the camping and recreation function was debated and approved in principle under the reorganization bill which went through this House some time ago, so we are not really debating that principle in here. I think that what I should say, Mr. Speaker, is that what we have attempted to do—I'm not going to talk about the merits of the change—is we've added to our bill certain provisions so that our ministry can indeed keep some hand in the area of recreation. As the hon. member is probably aware, we did not transfer the complete youth and recreation branch. We have kept certain people in our regional office and certain people in head office and the Ontario athletic leadership camp at Lake Couchiching within our ministry, because these people will be dealing with this broad problem of recreation and the development of the community school programmes so that we have a liaison within the Ministry of Education. These people will be in our ministry, dealing with this to provide, as the member has said, the very excellent liaison that was going on; we hope that this will be developed through what we've done.

Incidentally, people like Mr. Garvie are still in the Ministry of Education. He didn't switch and 10 or 12 other people are still in our ministry to carry this on.

In reply to the questions about the equalization factor, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that because the assessments are frozen, the Department of Municipal Affairs did not intend to issue any new equalization factors and we decided to take this over. This was done in co-operation with them and there is no appeal from the equalization factors that have been set by the Minister of Education.

Our factors were arrived at by taking the higher of either last year's, that's the 1970 Department of Municipal Affairs' factor, or 90 per cent of the average of the last three years of the DMA factors—whichever was the higher. Based on that formula, we took the higher equalization factor for each municipality. The 1970 Department of Municipal Affairs equalization factors were appealable and hopefully, that corrected any inequity

that was present. If there were any ups and downs, taking the 90 per cent of the average of the last three years also corrected any inequities that might have been there if we'd taken just the 1970 factor.

We think that at this point in time, we have factors that are fairly effective. As I say, Mr. Speaker, we've formulated and gone into setting these factors because there are no Department of Municipal Affairs' factors since 1970 and we've attempted to even out the fluctuations. As the hon. member knows, these equalization factors are used for three areas—apportionment of costs, legislative grants and the representation process; they're used in all those three.

In regard to the comments about the textbooks, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. member that what we are doing here is putting the authority in our legislation to publish Circulars 14 and 15. We've been publishing them and, of course, the logical question is why? I think that you can find sections in our legislation that certainly allow us to do this, but nothing that directly says the ministry shall publish Circular 14 and Circular 15. One is the approved list of textbooks and the other is supplemental material and so forth.

I really would disagree with the hon. member who said we shouldn't publish a list of approved books. I think the list we're now publishing, as he probably gathered from my opening remarks on my estimates the other night, is a vastly different list from the one used before. Indeed, it tries to do the kind of thing he wants; it gives a wide variety of books which are available.

I certainly think that there is still incumbent upon the Ministry of Education and the Minister of Education the responsibility to publish a list of approved textbooks for use in the schools. I think that only through this mechanism can we really put the emphasis on, for instance, Canadian textbooks, written and published by Canadians. Through this mechanism, we can put them on the approved list and be sure that they are drawn to the attention of everyone and that those are the ones which are used.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, we'll be happy to debate these sections in the committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be referred to the standing committee?

Agreed.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves second reading of Bill 125, An Act to amend the Public Schools Act.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have one brief comment concerning this bill and that deals with section 3. I think it is a forward step to eliminate the idea of staggered elections and to have one great big general election day throughout the Province of Ontario.

Our school system has a real responsibility to teach citizenship and I think by having the one day set aside every two years—if that is going to be the way, if Bill 77, the Act respecting Municipal Elections, does go through this House—then I think we should go all out in selling the idea of democracy and one great big election day in the province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): In going over the bill, like the member for Windsor-Walkerville I was delighted to see the elimination of the staggered elections. I think the results of the last several elections for school boards have been an indication as to why we need elections held simultaneously with municipal elections, because the turnouts have been pathetic. In the Sudbury area, I believe it was 11 or 12 per cent or some ridiculous figure, and certainly we don't get the type of representation we might want with only 11 or 12 per cent of the population voting. I think this is a forward move.

I would also like to comment on the language of this bill. I hope it is not just my imagination but it seems to be much simpler and much easier to interpret the language of the bill with some of the clauses being replaced. It seems to be very straightforward and clears up some of the areas that could have been misconstrued in the past.

There is one area of the bill that bothers me and I guess we will get to discuss it during the estimates and that is section 12. I really don't want to get into a clause by clause study, but with the public school boards collecting revenues in municipalities where there is no public school, am I correct in assuming that if there is only a separate school in that particular community, such as Killarney, it is possible for the public school board to direct the funds to the separate school board to assist the children who might be from non-Catholic homes—in other

words to pay the tuition fee? I understand this occurs in Killarney.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't think it is possible.

Mr. Martel: It seems to me if we are going to collect some revenue, Mr. Minister—and there are very few towns in which this occurs, I know—but in the one or two towns that it might occur across the province, would it not be advisable to have some means whereby those moneys which are collected could be used to offset tuition fees which the parents might be forced to pay directly to the separate school board? I think of Killarney as the point in question.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to deal with that Killarney situation more in committee; I think that would be the appropriate place.

I would like to say that, of course, we wouldn't be introducing this legislation if we didn't feel there shouldn't be staggered elections. In the development of the new Municipal Election Act certainly the Ministry of Education, and myself as minister, have agreed that school board elections should be at the same time and coupled together with one municipal election day in Ontario. We certainly think this will be a forward step, and I would agree with the hon. member for Windsor-Wakerville that I think this will have a great effect on the school system, because it will put emphasis, in the schools, on municipal elections, exactly as it has been put on provincial and federal elections.

I don't know, though; it kind of boggles the mind to think how they are going to get all the municipal candidates into some of those auditorium sessions that we had. They may have to provide a couple of days if they decide to do that, but they will have to work those arrangements out.

Mr. B. Newman: Will there be consideration given to closing the schools for that day?

Mr. Martel: Do it on Sunday.

Hon. Mr. Wells: To close the schools for election day? No, we don't close them for provincial election day.

I would like to also say, in commenting on the member's remarks about the language in the bills being perhaps easier to interpret, I am happy to hear these comments, because certainly I would agree that anything that can be done to make any bills of this Legislature easier for we non-lawyers to interpret has got to be a step forward.

Mr. Foulds: That has the support of my colleague from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick).

Hon. Mr. Wells: I might just say to the hon. member that I hope, all being well, we will be able to introduce into this Legislature, within a year, a consolidated education Act which will consolidate all these five Acts—or the situation may prevail that we will have to have four Acts in one Act, I don't know yet; but I hope that we will be able to consolidate them and do exactly this with the total education Acts, make them simple, easy to understand and get everything that pertains to one subject into one section.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand the minister is ordering this to the standing committee?

Agreed.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Hon. Mr. Wells moves second reading of Bill 126, an Act to amend the Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, other than the assessment portion of Bill 126, section 6, sub-section 3, on which my colleague the member for Waterloo North will have some comments to make, I would like the minister at the outset, when he makes his remarks, to explain to me if section 1 of the bill gives the individual the opportunity to attend any school in the community, or does that simply mean that the student will have to attend a school in the area or section of the community in which his father lives?

Section 4 of the bill I think is a good move, and that is permitting boards to appoint committees on a temporary basis to delve into vocational courses. Now that the vocational courses seem to be many in number and that changes are required all the time, I think a temporary committee is by far superior to having a permanent committee.

The next section that I would like to comment on, Mr. Speaker, is the status of a resident pupil as listed in section 16 of the bill. If the minister would explain that I think that would be sufficient, and when the bill comes up for the committee then we can ask additional questions of the minister and the ministry at that time.

The permission of an individual to run for an elective office without having paid his municipal property taxes is a good section. I don't see any reason why an individual, who because of financial limitations is unable to pay his municipal property tax within a given period of time should be disqualified from running for some type of elective office. I think that is a forward move on the part of the minister.

The last is section 17, where a student on reaching the age of 18 now is considered an adult and as a result can, if I am not mistaken, attend any school in the community that he so wishes. This is the extent of my comment and I hope the minister will be able to reply later.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the section where the hon. member wished me to explain about residence?

Mr. B. Newman: Section 1, 16 and 17.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments regarding this bill. I gather many amendments in this particular bill are required because of the new Municipal Elections Act, which we are in the process of passing now. I would ask the minister's comments, either now or in committee of the whole, to help clear up the uncertainty and the concern which exists in the minds of separate school administrators in my area, as well as across the province.

This is due to the fact that according to the Municipal Election Act, the clerk of the municipality will be the keeper of the enumeration roll, which will include the school support. The assessment office will be required to keep only actual assessment on properties, as I understand it, and school support will be the determination of the municipal clerk. It will be up to him to keep the enumeration roll up to date from one year to the next.

Now, I understand there is a great deal of concern among school board members as to the adequacy of this arrangement; how the clerk is going to keep it up to date; and whether all municipal clerks are going to have to keep a separate school support book —which I understand is kept by very few presently.

While we have had the assurance from the minister that the Municipal Election Act would be amended to include addresses on the enumeration roll, which it doesn't include at the present time, the separate school supporters are still quite concerned.

I am wondering, too, if the minister is aware that—I don't know if there is provision in here for it or not; according to the present Municipal Election Act, children over 18 years of age of separate school supporters will not be able to vote for separate school board members.

My understanding is that some of these things have to be corrected in the Separate School Administration Act; and if not now, surely later when we deal with it in committee of the whole. These matters can be dealt with so that the present administrators of the separate school boards will have the assurance that they are not going to run into complicated difficulties in ascertaining proper separate school support as it relates to the assessment on the properties in the municipalities.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, my comments on this will be brief; but it is a grab-bag bill and we will have ample opportunity to discuss it in committee. However, there are two or three sections which I would like to make some initial comment on.

One is section 1, because it puzzles me to some extent. Is the department saying in section 1 that, in effect, the local assessment is not a significant factor? So that, a person who is not resident with his partners or guardian, and therefore not paying direct taxes at the municipal level, will be free to go to school.

I think this is a forward move if that is the interpretation of the department; that in some of those unfortunate cases where, for various reasons, a pupil is not getting along with his parents and is legitimately living with another family—or an aunt or uncle, perhaps—that he will be allowed to go to school without penalty.

I'll take them in order. Unlike the spokesman for the Liberal Party, I feel a little uneasy about the changes outlined in section 4. I would be much happier if the word "may" in the second line was "shall." Because it seems to me that the intention of the provision now is to make the appointment of advisory committees a matter of choice of the board. I know there have been some faults with the standing advisory vocational committees in the past.

I like the idea that they can be short-term, and brought together for specific questions or matters. But if we make it optional for the elected school board—and the school boards by and large have been elected in recent years with a very low turnout of

electorates—we are cutting down or narrowing the possibility here of involvement on the local community level. I would like, in fact, to see the principle stated clearly that we should have advisory committees not only for vocational areas and subjects, but in many areas of the school curriculum; and that they be drawn from many areas of life within the community that the school serves. I think that, unless the minister and his officials can satisfactorily answer that particular reservation that we have, we will be looking at that particular section very closely indeed during the committee stage.

The other comment that I wanted to make was on section 17, which I think is a very good and forward-looking move. I think this is a recognition that ties the school legislation in line with the change brought down to reduce the age of majority to 18. It recognizes that people in attendance at secondary schools of age 18 or over are full-fledged citizens of the community. It means that if the person is not living at home he is considered a resident of the district in which he resides.

I might point out it will be particularly beneficial to some of the senior grade sudents in northern Ontario towns who perhaps would not get the full range of programme within their actual home community, but if they moved, say from a place like Schreiber to a place like Thunder Bay, they would be able to take advantage of some of the options offered in a bigger centre. I think, provided the student concerned and his parents accept this procedure, that that's a very healthy move and I would like to commend the minister and his department on that particular section.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, in answering these comments, I would first say that section 1 of the bill provides that a pupil who resides in the same secondary school district as his parent or guardian is a resident pupil even though he does not reside with his parents. Now this doesn't mean that he has unlimited access to any school he chooses there. If the board in that area has chosen to set attendance areas, he still must go to the school in the area where he is residing, even though that isn't with his parents.

What it means is that he doesn't have to be living at the home of his parents to be eligible as a full, resident pupil; but if the board has restrictions to attendance areas, he has to go to the school in that area. As the hon. member knows, a lot of boards have removed total attendance areas.

Mr. B. Newman: On a point of clarification, did the minister say that he would have to go to the school in the area in which he resides—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, in the area in which he resides.

Mr. B. Newman: —or his parents reside?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, in which he resides.

Mr. B. Newman: He resides himself.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No. It means that he is considered a resident in that area where he is residing in the full sense.

Section 17 that we have referred to does something else. It refers to people over 18 going to any new jurisdiction. Previously, they had to be resident there for a year before they could attend a school without paying fees. This now removes that restriction, and a person over 18, who is now an adult, if he moves to any school jurisdiction is immediately eligible to attend a secondary school in that area.

As for the section about advisory vocational committees, Mr. Speaker, we have had many requests over the past few years not to make this a mandatory provision. I think there was good and just reason that it be mandatory when it was inserted in the legislation, because vocational training, technical training, was something that was new in some areas. It had been going on for a great number of years in others, but there was a great emphasis to expand it through our whole system. This was to give real impetus to that and to provide for a board having a committee that had as its major concern this particular facet of the educational process.

With the development of the programmes in vocational and technical education, particularly over the last 10 years, and the federal grants, we now have very highly developed and sophisticated technical and vocational education in most of our boards in this province—in fact, I would feel in pretty nearly all the large ones.

We feel that a school board is elected by the people in its community or jurisdiction. Under our new procedures we feel they will be elected by a much more representative group of people than they have ever been before and that they should have the right to decide what types of committees they want to set up.

They may wish to set up two or three committees in the vocational area. This

doesn't say they can only set up one. They can set up two or three to govern different areas of vocational training. They can put one trustee on the committee and five or 10 outside people. They won't be limited. We think that to give them this right is a forward step and we would certainly like to see how it works.

In answer to the questions raised about separate schools, I'd like the hon. member to know that certainly it is my concern, and the Ministry of Education's concern, that there be no impediments placed in the way of separate school supporters being able to vote properly or indicate properly which system they wish to support.

I'd rather go into details about this at the committee stage, because if there are sections in these Acts which don't do what the separate school people want, I'd be happy to hear from them in our committee, so that we can be sure as far as our Act is concerned, that we have done everything possible to assure them and guarantee them the rights which are theirs. We will do that.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Some hon. members: No, committee.

Mr. Speaker: Standing committee?

Agreed.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves second reading of Bill 127, An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, there are only two comments I would like to make at this time concerning the bill.

The first is on section 3 of the bill; right at the bottom of the page there is the request that the individual's occupation be included. Is that absolutely necessary? I notice that in the provincial Elections Act the occupation is not included, so why would you need the occupation of an individual who is going to attend the meeting?

The only other section to which I would like to make reference, Mr. Speaker, is section 18. This is the one, once again, in which a separate school supporter is supposed to be defined according to the Elections Act and in which there is no firm definition, especially in relation to people 18 years old and over. I wonder if there may not be some need for further clarification on that point?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Which section?

Mr. B. Newman: It is 18(1)(*j*).

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to elaborate or comment on what was said on the previous bill, which was similar to this. I was disappointed with section 18 on the separate school supporter. In the last three or four years, not only have I met with the former Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), now the first citizen, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), I have made repeated appeals on behalf of a group of separate school supporters who can't be separate school supporters.

I am talking about those people where a mixed marriage is involved, and we have a good many of them in northern Ontario. As the minister is aware, I am sure, in the event of a mixed marriage where the husband happens to be a Catholic, he can support the separate school system despite the fact his wife is non-Catholic.

However, in the reverse there should be, in my opinion, permissive legislation where the husband is a non-Catholic and the wife is Catholic, and should they be sending their children to a separate school, that in fact the parent may support the separate school if he so desires.

He can do it now but he has to do one of two things. He has to indicate that he is a Catholic, and this might be very distasteful to him. I, for one, agree that he shouldn't have to fill in an application form saying that he is a Catholic; I think it is discriminatory legislation. The other point is he can turn the house over to his wife, which again is unacceptable to some non-Catholic men; and again I don't blame them.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, and I have been pounding at it for 4½ years, that the government now look at it realistically. I have had all kinds of assurances from the first citizen and from the Minister of Municipal Affairs that this would be looked into and dealt with. I have a file that I bet is an inch thick on it. Now that we are getting some amendments we have an opportunity to change this by permissive legislation. I'm not saying it should be compulsory. I'm saying it should be permissive. In the event of a mixed marriage—and it would only apply then

—if a man wants to send his children to the separate school, he should be able to support that school. And it should be permissive. That way there would be no fear in the non-Catholic community that the Catholic community is trying to raid their school and get some of their supporters.

What in fact happens is that sometimes they have to pay tuition, which prevents the children from going to the school that the wife might want, and the husband really doesn't care. But he refuses to sign the house over or to say he's Catholic, and on both counts I agree with him. I would ask the minister if he could possibly introduce some amendments when we go to committee, which would be permissive in nature, to allow this to occur.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, dealing with that last point first, I am afraid that in the time I have been minister I haven't had an opportunity to pursue the thick file that the member has—and I am sure it is probably somewhere in our ministry—of his concerns about this matter with my predecessors, but I'll be glad to look into it.

There may be some technical, constitutional or very involved legal problems involved here, which I again would not know about. I'll be happy to look into that and perhaps we can more fully discuss it in the committee, as we will do with section 18(1)(j) in the same context and spirit as I indicated on the previous bill. But we don't want to do anything here to make things any different for separate school supporters or to put any impediments in their way in taking part in the elective process.

I was just going to say, in regard to the word "occupation," that I think we can take a look at that and it might be possible to remove that at committee. It has been in the Act for many years, but as the hon. member notes, I think we have removed "occupation" in the Municipal Elections Act now as one of the things that appears on the ballot, and perhaps it is time that we removed it here. So we can look at that in committee and if necessary we can take it out.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 127.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Is it agreed that it go to the standing committee?

Agreed.

SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves second reading of Bill 128, An Act to amend the Schools Administration Act.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, this is the bill that probably will cause the greatest controversy of any of the bills that the minister has introduced in the Legislature.

The principles of the bill are numerous and, as a result, it will be difficult to speak in generalizations concerning them. You will have to make comment concerning the principles involved in the various sections.

On section 4 of the bill, it makes mention of a child not necessarily having to attend school, provinding he or she is receiving satisfactory instruction at home or elsewhere.

I simply wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this doesn't really open a door; how does one judge whether the youth is receiving satisfactory instruction? It may be satisfactory in the eyes of the parent, but it might leave a lot of doubt in the eyes of an educator.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It is good for the educators to be doubted occasionally.

Mr. B. Newman: May I next move on to section 5, which I think is a good amendment? It prevents a truant officer, as he was once referred to, but who is now known as an attendance counsellor, from being able to barge into a home, or into a place of occupation of an individual without a warrant. I think that McRuer mentioned something similar to this; and this is a forward step.

Now, the age of majority has caused a lot of problems in the various legislative Acts and, as a result, there is going to be a lot of housekeeping needed. I noticed in section 6, the minister takes care of it fairly well. I would just wonder if that same housekeeping would not be needed in a lot of other places in the original Act.

The absence from school of students unable to derive any benefit from attendance in school is a question that was debated in this House not too long ago. Members on all sides of the House agreed that an individual should be allowed to leave school at an earlier age; especially if he is not getting any benefit whatsoever by his presence at school or, naturally, by his absence. There would generally be no type of school educational advantage—you don't necessarily get education only in a classroom.

Section 9 permits the payment of a teacher's salary when he is summoned for

jury duty. I would just ask the minister, will that affect a teacher's accumulated sick leave, because he would be absent from school? I know the board would pay him, but quite often, even though they may pay him, they deduct that as one day from his cumulative sick leave. It could have some type of an effect on the individual who is not in the best of health and may use up substantial numbers of days of his school accumulative sick leave.

In section 10 of the bill, the minister has the authority to grant a certificate to a Canadian citizen for a landed immigrant who is otherwise qualified. I just wonder, rather than simply referring to a landed immigrant, should there not been some stipulation that the individual has intention of becoming a Canadian citizen?

I noticed in some of the jurisdictions to the south of us that before an individual will be accepted and given an interim teaching certificate, he has to sign an intent of becoming an American citizen. I am just wondering if that is not a good practice. If it is, it should be put into practice here in Ontario.

I think the confidentiality of pupils' records is a forward step. Too often in the past, pupils' records have been available to too many individuals, even in the school system itself. I think now that the minister has made the various amendments, it is a worthwhile and a forward move on the part of the department. Likewise, the destruction of these records, which were mentioned in a prior bit of legislation, is good legislation. The individual should have the right to come along and see what is on it, and have expurgated from the records anything that he believes can be harmful to him.

The mandatory provision of liability insurance for a board and its employees and volunteers assigned to duties by a principal, is a thing that as a coach always did disturb me in the past. You never knew, when you were assisting youth and having outside individuals come in, if someone would get hurt in an after-school activity and then you might be legally responsible because of the individual's injury. Requiring the board to carry liability insurance is the way it should have been right along.

The use of volunteer assistants in a school is something that offers all kinds of fascinating opportunities for citizen participation. When the committee on utilization of educational facilities travelled about Ontario, we visited Assumption High School in the city of Windsor and we noticed that they have a bank of approximately 50 ladies who came in on a regular basis, contributing at least a half a day a week of their services free of charge to assist the educational programme. In this way the teachers themselves were put to better use right in the classroom, while the volunteer assistants did a lot of the clerical work.

Now, I don't think that volunteer assistants should be assigned solely clerical work. They may be more knowledgeable than a lot of the teachers in given fields, and as a result, the use of volunteer assistants enhances the educational opportunity of the individual.

The bill likewise permits an educational programme to be carried on in a juvenile detention centre and in an observation home. This is good, providing the individual could not be possibly sent out to obtain his education at a local institution. If the home or centre is big enough to make use of a teacher, I think the teacher should be provided to the juvenile detention centre or observation home. Now this will also increase the cost of education to the municipality, and as such I think there should be special provisions to reimburse the municipality for any added educational expense.

The next section of the bill that I would like to make comment on is section 20, which in my estimation is probably the most controversial section of all, and at this time I would like to bring to the minister's attention some of the concern of the separate school boards regarding this section.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They all asked for it.

Mr. B. Newman: I beg your pardon, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They asked to have that section.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, Rev. Carl Matthews, who is sort of a spokesman in the view of many, and considered a consultant on the Ontario separate schools, mentions in the May 13 issue of the Catholic Register that allowing joint agreements between boards can have an extremely harmful effect, unless the department has some type of control or assures the separate school boards that this is not the back-door method of completely merging the two systems and in that way bringing about the eventual abolition of the separate school system. Now his comment reads as follows:

> Why resort to abolition by attrition when abolition by merger is quieter? One can kill with a club or with a bear hug;

> the end result is the same. The schools and boards that the separate school supporters were guaranteed in perpetuity, have a different philosophy than have secular schools and their boards. In daily practice and in provincial law they have a Catholic identity.

So he is very much concerned that this is the eventual assimilation of the school system by means of a merger.

A member of the Windsor school board, a Mr. Amedee Janisse by name, who is a past chairman of the board—speaking in a panel discussion, not too long ago in Toronto; and that is April—made mention that, and I am quoting him, referring to the school sharing:

> It depreciates our system when you start to share with someone else.

He is extremely concerned that the system will be completely assimilated within a short period of time.

I hope the minister, in his reply to my comments, assures him that there is no such intention on the part of the government; and that the school system will remain just as viable, or maybe even more viable in the future than it has been in the past.

Now, the Windsor Separate School Board itself, in a meeting just the other day, had the following comments. And this comment was made by a Mr. George Page, one of the trustees who commented on Harold Greer's article—and I am certain that the minister is familiar with Mr. Greer's comments.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I never read them.

Mr. B. Newman: You wouldn't want me to read them to you, would you Mr. Minister? They deal with "assimilating separate schools by merger." It happens to be a fairly good article, Mr. Minister; it carries your picture.

An hon. member: Let's have a look.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): That is the only good thing about it.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. George Page mentions that the separate school board is concerned with the proposed new legislation that will allow public school boards to "gobble up" the separate school system in Ontario. In fact, the school system itself is going to employ a lawyer to look into the constitutional rights of their system to see if this legislation doesn't violate it.

Likewise, the Essex County School Board took a fairly strong stand. One of the trustees, Bernard O'Gorman by name, makes mention of this; and I quote:

> This is a sinister movement to eliminate almost entirely the separate school system in the province.

I hope that the minister in his replies will be able to put the record straight as far as the joint agreements to the use of facilities are concerned. I am sure he is aware of the extreme concern of members of the separate school board.

Now, section 24 of the bill permits the boards of education to finally fall in line with the Municipal Act, and that is to pay for the cost of all of the fringe benefits that the municipal employees won back some two or three years ago. I can recall speaking on this maybe eight or 10 years ago and suggesting that this was going to take place, because this was the way industry operated; it was a foregone conclusion that sooner or later government would catch up with industry.

The provisions under section 27 permitting a school board to acquire property outside the confines of its own municipal boundaries and also to go into multi-use buildings—I think it is good. I think it is the kind of legislation that can make for a better educational system. It can put education much closer to the student, especially with some of these big highrise complexes. There is no reason why some type of educational facility could not be encompassed within the confines of the highrise building.

The permission of a board to purchase land, either from conservation authorities or from others, for setting up natural science schools, is a forward step. I only hope that the government here considers the leasing of Pèche Island to the city of Windsor, so that they could use this as a nature school—one of the uses to which the island could be put.

Mr. Speaker, that completes the comments that I have made concerning Bill 128 and I hope the minister does reply to them at the appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, Bill 128 is certainly a compendium. There are many very good things in the bill. In fact, in looking at some of the section of the bill, I realize that I wrote part of my lead-off on the

Education estimates a little too early and I'll have to revise them. The minister has cut the ground from under me on one or two occasions.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He's getting to be one of the finest ministers in the government.

Mr. Lewis: If only Harold Greer were in the gallery today.

An hon. member: If only the Chairman of the Management Board would follow his example.

Mr. Foulds: There are a few comments I would like to make. I would like, particularly, to compliment the government on section 4. I think that the business of opening the doors of the school is a forward step. The fact that parents will have more say in what they consider to be adequate education for their child is an excellent idea. I hope it leads to a whole opening out of the educational system, so that we no longer are stuck with the idea that schooling and education occur only in buildings.

There are other sections of the bill that go along with that general philosophy. I for one find them very encouraging indeed, so, I am afraid that we would substantially differ from the Liberal Party on section 4, and support the government in that section.

Rather a nostalgic twinge passed through me as I read the explanation of section 12 with the references to visitors books, school register, and schoolhouse key. Sort of a twinge of nostalgia of my days in a rural schoolhouse up north passed through me. But that's as it may be.

However, on section 13 I am afraid that this is a section that we will have some differences on, tied in with the reference that I made to one of the earlier bills that the minister brought out. I want to put it to him fairly strongly right now. If section 13(1) is passed along with those subsections it will very severely limit the use of learning materials of a teacher. It says the duties of a teacher will include "to use and permit to be used" only approved textbooks. That is added to the duties of the teacher.

What in goodness happens when a teacher comes across a new book that has been published that year and is not an approved textbook? Can he bring it into the classroom? Can he use sections from it? This is the reservation that I have, about whether that is so and if he can still use additional materials, excerpts from books of all kinds, whether they be literature from any of the parties of an election campaign, to political manifestos of any parties, to all kinds of sociological and economic material that often has importance as a teaching material because of its very relevance—monthly magazine articles and that kind of thing. I'll be speaking in the estimates on that kind of approach later on.

If during committee the minister can assure us that that restriction, that straitjacketing, will not happen, and that the safety is embodied in the legislation, then we will rest much happier. This goes along through that whole section, including the principal's approval in subsection 3, that I'd like some clarification on.

Section 14, however, is in my short experience in the House, I think perhaps one of the best drafted pieces of legislation in terms of amendment that has been done. I think it's particularly pleasing because it's not just a motherhood piece of amendment. It covers both the confidentiality necessary for the school records and it also covers, if I understand the bill correctly on reading some of the subsections of section 14, some of the detail that should rightly be in the school records.

One can get a cumulative impression of the type of student you're dealing with, particularly if he moves from school to school. A guidance counsellor or a teacher, if a student has a problem in a particular area, can readily see whether that problem is because of the move or whether it's been a consistent problem. I think that is a job well done and I think the minister's officials deserve commendation for it.

Section 18, subsection 2, the allowance of voluntary assistance, of course, is a forward step. We can discuss in more detail during committee some of the suggestions for areas in which that perhaps can be defined more clearly in the regulations or broadened, for that matter.

On section 19, I think we will reserve our comments until the committee stage. I think we need to be pretty clear about what is involved in the sharing—the initial reaction in this party is favourable, I must say. There were two or three other brief comments that I had—it's much longer than I thought.

Section 24, which is basically enabling legislation that allows the board to pick up the cost of insurance or health services, is another forward step. I think that certainly will be well received by those concerned, teachers and husbands of teachers. I know

I'll really look forward to that possibility in the legislation.

Section 27, the multi-use buildings; I think this gets us into what may, in fact, become a forward-looking area in government policy. I think we should look at it, not only in the terms of multi-use mentioned by the previous speaker where you get into sharing apartment buildings or shopping plazas or what-have-you, we have to begin to look because the school population is moving so much these days.

The buildings which we would normally, in previous times, have called temporary or semi-permanent, would be designed from the beginning so that other uses could be made of them when the school population deserted the area, as is sometimes happening in downtown cores. They would be used for other community uses, in terms of the arts or crafts or recreation programmes. I think in section 27 there is the beginning of an idea in that direction.

I have a frivolous comment about section 28, but first of all the serious comment. I think that, once again, this is an outward-looking step, a step toward legislation that makes the classroom larger than the old formal school. The ability to acquire land for conducting natural science programmes, I think, is a very good step. Perhaps we can get into this in committee. It often seems to me that programmes—I have had some experience in an experiment in this area—that settings that we would naturally think of initially for natural science programmes are often very good settings for creative writing and other kinds of programmes, because the immediate stimulus is there rather than the second-hand stimulus that students often get through books. I would hope that we wouldn't be restrictive when interpreting this section, because I would like to see a real development take place in those areas. I am very pleased with section 28.

I think that is enough praise heaped on the minister's head and on the department for the time being, but basically, I think the bill will receive a thorough discussion. We won't always agree when it comes up before committee, but there are certainly many good sections in the bill and I commend the government for them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): In the legislation that we have in front of us the government seems to be following public opinion and getting in line after the public pulse has been felt, but I for one am opposed to the control of the minister over the textbooks that will be used and the lack of latitude that the teacher will have in the classroom. I think many of us over the years will agree that the best teachers we ever had took a lot of human nature and things out of life which could teach better than following a set curriculum.

I am concerned about the fact that the minister can say, in clause 1 of section 13, that we must follow "only the textbooks approved by the minister." I think this is wrong. I think that there should be, as my colleague on the left here said, something left to the wisdom of the teacher, to teach current events as things are happening and as books come in during the school term. I am very much opposed to that because we have, through school consolidation, complete government control of our educational system; we have centralized all our power here at Queen's Park and I think that with the harm you have done to our system it will take years to get back to the system we used to have.

We have complete proof that every area of the States that went into consolidation has gone back into giving the control back to the people in the area. So I think it is a bad step to give the minister the right to say that only he can approve of the textbooks used in the classroom. On the other hand, I am in favour of clause 21, where they are now going to include on the boards members of the Indian council, where they have students in their schools. I think this is a plus and I congratulate the minister on this part.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to just say a few words about this matter of textbooks. We may get into it in more detail in the committee, but I am really sorry that the hon. members opposite feel that there is some intention to restrict. As a matter of fact if they read the previous legislation, which I think we considered rather archaic, it provided that if they didn't use the textbooks we could withhold the grants and things like that.

Mr. Foulds: I'm glad the minister never caught me.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There is certainly no intention to try and restrict the process that goes on in the classroom. The hon. member who just spoke was in the House when I delivered my remarks the other night and

perhaps he heard them. The whole thrust of these remarks was the kind of approach that we are taking to curriculum today, and the kind of climate that we want to create for the teacher to develop the curriculum herself and in company with her fellow teachers.

While we certainly feel that we have to produce a list of approved textbooks—if the hon. member would look at the list he would see it is a very extensive list—the Act also says "and books approved by the board." They have an authority here to add books. And as far as supplemental—I beg your pardon?

Mr. Foulds: But that has to happen with the approval of the board the year previous to the teaching year?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, the board has to officially take our list and approve it; they may remove some. But that's for approved textbooks. Now a teacher can bring anything he or she wants into the classroom as supplemental material. I am sure that many of them do this. And Circular 15, which is the circular we have talked about for the past couple of weeks from time to time in the House here—

Mr. Sargent: You say "only," Mr. Minister. Would you take out the world "only" then? You say "only textbooks that are approved by the minister." Why don't you take out the word "only"?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We can talk in detail about that in committee, but what we are trying to emphasize here are the textbooks. There are the textbooks which are used and provided and then there is the supplemental material, which goes far beyond that approved list.

As I was starting to say, in Circular 15 which we talked about, the circular of Canadian teaching aids, you will find that there may be a little overlap with books which are in Circular 14, the approved text books, but most of them are material quite apart from what is in the list of approved textbooks. There are all kinds of supplemental printed material and so forth that can be used in the classroom and certainly this is what we encourage.

On this matter of textbooks I was just going to say as an aside that I talked the other night about this new course, People and in Politics. I see that some of the newspapers were commenting on this. If the members would read it, this course outline talks about, I think, 18 different subjects that we are going to encourage teachers to talk about under this new course. Things like the emergence of society, political systems and democracy.

One of the areas is dissent and in this area of dissent our curriculum guideline suggests that:

> The whole process of dissent could be worked into a curriculum and that it would be developed in the context of meaning a point of view in disagreement with established patterns, or formulated policies.

Then the guideline says that to tackle these questions:

> Groups of students might be encouraged to examine case studies such as the Riel rebellion, contemporary local or national political or public issues, relevant literature, the ideas and strategies of individuals (such as Saul Alinsky, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Cesar Chavez, Jesus Christ, Danilo Dolci, Mahatma Gandhi, Che Guevara, Martin Luther King, William Lyon Mackenzie, Herbert Marcuse, John Stuart Mill, Emily Pankhurst, Boris Pasternak, Socrates, Henry Thoreau, Pierre Trudeau, J. S. Woodsworth) and other groups.

So you can see we have suggested they use the ideas of quite a broad group as literature.

I would just like to tell the House that the Minister of Education didn't write that list, but if the Minister of Education had written that list I think I would have made one addition and that is John Diefenbaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —and I am going to recommend that to my officials if we reprint this course of study again.

But anyway what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I think we have changed what I think is archaic legislation in regard to textbooks, but we still feel that there must be authority from the ministry to publish lists and that through this we will, I think, be able to achieve our aim of encouraging the use of more Canadian-produced textbooks written by Canadians.

Many of the questions and comments that have been brought up I think we can deal better with in committee. I would just like to deal with a couple of things in my remarks.

First, the remark about the provision for allowing a board to provide schooling for those in detention centres and so forth. We also have a regulation that goes along with this that provides that we will reimburse the

boards for this schooling that they do, and we reimburse them for the salaries of teachers and $1,000 per year for consultation services and $3,000 for the furnishings of the classrooms that have to be used in those centres. So this provides the authority for the boards to provide that kind of education and we are also supplying the money to the boards so that they can provide it.

I appreciate the comments from the critics from the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party who spoke about our section on pupil records. This is a section that we have worked on for the last couple of months to try and bring into effect what I think we all feel should be done in regard to these records. We have here a section that provides for the confidentiality of the records, for access to these records by the pupil or his parents and a provision for changing, or at least having a hearing if you disagree or dispute something that is found in that record. I think that in this day and age this is something that must be done.

As my hon. friend from Windsor-Walkerville knows, some of the members of his profession still have doubts about this kind of process we are entering into. Probably the hon. member for Port Arthur has heard these doubts too; I don't know. But certainly we feel, notwithstanding these doubts, that we must push ahead with this, that this is the kind of legislation we must have. We must have protection of these records and accessibility to them by the person about whom they are made.

Mr. Martel: Could I ask the minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. Martel: Would the minister consider including in there—I realize he might meet with some hostility—a section which would state that the teachers who are receiving new students in September, say, are not allowed to see the students' records for at least a month and a half or two months so that they won't prejudge the child before they know the child? I've seen this done over and over again, and I think it is really detrimental when these conditions or these ideas are formulated before the child really knows the teacher. Frequently, if the child had a bad scene in another grade, let's say, he might get along first rate with a new teacher without any preconceived notions about that child, but when a teacher reads that stupid OSR card he sometimes prejudges the child.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Of course, in this light, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may be basing his opinion to some degree on the old type of OSR cards we have, although there will still be room for comments and certain things on the new cards. But at this point in time I wouldn't want to give a definitive answer to that; it is something that I would be happy to look at, but it might be a very difficult thing to do and I don't know whether it would be of benefit or not. But we will take a look at it.

I don't know whether the hon. member has seen the new card. He may find, in looking at it, that it doesn't have the same disadvantages as the old ones or he may find that it still does. But we'll look at that.

Mr. Foulds: Could we have samples of this card?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, we will arrange to have samples sent to you. As the hon. members are perhaps aware, this is not something that has been developed overnight; it is part of a project that has gone on for the last couple of years. These cards have been pretested in about four schools already in this province, including a secondary school, an elementary school and a separate school. We're tried to get all the bugs out of the system.

As they will probably also note, one of the sections here also applies the confidentiality sections of this legislation to old records, although it does not apply the accessibility to old records. But all those records for those pupils presently in school will be transferred to the new cards, so the new provisions will apply; and once the old cards have been transferred they will be destroyed.

The only people we are then attempting to protect are those who have left school but whose cards still remain in the school. It is basically a policy to keep them for about 10 years; after that, certain information is changed to a permanent record card, then the student record with the comments is destroyed, as I understand it.

We have tried to cover all possibilities and protect the confidentiality as well as providing the accessibility in regard to the new cards.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question here? What would his department do about records that may not be the official records which are kept by members of the staff or by the school; that is, they would not be on the OSR card?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, the definition provides that anything put into the student record—and it is in the form of a file folder—is also considered part of the record; so anything that the school keeps in that record will be part of the record and all the provisions of the Act will apply to that.

I should tell the members of the House that the matter of psychological and psychiatric tests is not covered in this legislation, because we do not have uniform agreement as to how these and certain health records should be handled by the various health professionals. They may be put in if a principal in a school desires to, but there is not a provision in the Act that says they have to be put in as part of this student record.

Mr. B. Newman: Are not some of the personal records concerning the student kept by a teacher?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we really are stating that these are defined and will be defined by the regulation as those records kept by the principal and the school in regard to that student. If the teacher keeps his own personal records I don't think we particularly encourage them to pass those on but I am not sure how they would handle that. Perhaps we could look into that in committee and see if there is any way in which you think it should be changed.

I was just going to remark first, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Port Arthur mentioned he had a little feeling of nostalgia when he saw that very archaic section about the record book and the school key vanishing from the Act. I guess many teachers would perhaps feel this way, but it rather shocked me to find that a teacher who had that key and lost it and couldn't return it could have his teaching certificate suspended under the legislation. This seemed a little harsh in this day and age so we thought we had better take it out.

The only thing that I would comment on is the section concerning the sharing of school facilities, because, I as minister, and our ministry view this as a very important section. I would say that this section has developed out of what has been going on. In other words, there has been a sense of sharing and of wanting to share facilities in some communities particularly between the public school boards and the separate school boards. It is a feeling of wanting to share that has been supported by the position of our ministry.

We encourage this in order to make the maximum and best utilization of present facilities. We are not encouraging this sharing of facilities to attempt in any way to do away with any school system. There is certainly no intent in this legislation to do that. We are not trying to merge the systems or to eliminate a system. I am sorry if some of our separate school trustees and friends feel this way because we certainly don't intend to do it.

I might tell the hon. member that this particular section was discussed with the separate school trustees before it was introduced here and, basically, their executives didn't raise any objections to me. I think it is very important that this be encouraged because, as I said, facilities are becoming vacant because of decreasing enrolments.

The facilities have been built, whether they be separate or public, by the taxpayers of this province. If, in a community, there is a school or part of a school that is vacant and yet another system needs classrooms, it becomes extravagant in this day and age to build a new school and forget about those facilities. Now there may be reason why a sharing arrangement can't be worked out and those will naturally be considered when each situation is looked at.

Mr. B. Newman: There will be no compulsion?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Basically there has to be—there will be no real compulsion but there will be a lot of gentle persuasion because this is a new idea and if people aren't encouraged to look at this alternative, I don't think they will consider it. The tendancy is to say, "We don't want to do it. Let's just leave that to one side and we will build a new school."

I think the hon. member is aware of the Firgrove situation in North York, and this is one of the situations which led us to develop this kind of legislation. Here we had the North York Public School Board build a public school based on a fairly large enrolment which they figured they would get. The separate school board established a separate school of a portable nature practically across the street.

When school started last fall, the public school wasn't nearly full. It didn't have nearly the number of students they anticipated. The separate school had many more students than they had made provision for in the portable accommodation and, indeed, that they could accommodate. The situation

in that area is obviously that the separate school is going to be the large school and the public school is going to be the small school. Yet the public school—a large building—is already built. We are trying to encourage negotiations between the two boards so that the separate school will buy the public school building which is already built and use it as their school, while the public school will build a small addition to that school to be their school.

They will share certain facilities like the library resource centre, and maybe the gymnasium, although this is in doubt; certain of the other ancillary space, cleaning areas and so forth. This will be a truly joint use of that site and of those facilities.

I must tell the hon. member that this particular approach that we have taken in Firgrove, suggesting this to the boards—they indeed encouraged us to consider this suggestion and we agreed with them—has won widespread appeal around this area and indeed across this province.

I've been reading many of the editorials in the papers and they suggest that the sharing of facilities is certainly something that we have to be looking at; that the school systems have to be looking at and I think that as a department it is incumbent upon us to encourage this. And we are going to do this.

Mr. Martel: Can I ask the minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, just a minute. All I'm saying, though, is that in this encouragement there is certainly no intent in any way to merge or do away with the present legal separate school system.

Mr. Martel: Would this include—

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 128. Carried?

Mr. Martel: I have asked the minister if I could ask a question. Surely—

Mr. Speaker: Well the minister has spoken, you spoke on the principle of the bill and the motion is at the present time for second reading of Bill 128.

Mr. Martel: I am just asking the minister if he will accept a question on this very point we were speaking on. Surely to God that isn't too much—

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion be carried?

Mr. Lawlor: We are going to challenge not the Speaker but you.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered to committee?

Agreed.

Mr. Martel: Well there are a couple of bills coming forward that aren't going to get through today just because of that—

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

Mr. Good moves second reading of Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the University of Waterloo.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments on the bill. First of all I find it a little distracting to be dealing with the bill when the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Kerr) is not here. I was going to compliment him on one aspect and ask him a very pointed question on another matter. I think the members of the Legislature should very briefly hear a little of the history of the bill. It has been many years in the making; it has been amended considerably, somewhat prematurely by the minister, which caused the problem with the bill not being printed in the form in which it was advertised—so it had to be readvertised and then sent to the private bills committee.

Most—in fact all except one of the original objections which I had to the bill—have been met. I am pleased to say that the minister did co-operate, Mr. Speaker, in reducing the number of appointments to the board of governors from 10 to seven. This reduction then accommodated an increase in the number of students on the board of governors from three to five, and also an increase of one more faculty member.

After much debate and a deal of persuasion we were able to incorporate into the bill the fact that all members of the board of governors should be Canadian citizens.

In this regard we followed the example of the University of Toronto Bill, which was a public bill, and dealt with, of course, a unicameral system with a governing council.

The matter of meetings being held in camera was discussed, and I think a very suitable amendment, which stipulated in a more specific fashion when in camera sessions of either the board or the senate could be

held, was introduced to the bill. The chancellor, of course, and the president, will have to be Canadian citizens because they are appointed to the board of governors.

My only personal dissatisfaction with the bill was that we did not specify anything regarding Canadian citizenship for the senate. It is not my intention, and I don't think it was possible, to have all members of the senate Canadian citizens.

Dr. Matthews did indicate that they could live with having a certain percentage of the senate Canadian citizens, because they do now have a very high percentage of the senate who are Canadian citizens. I would like to have seen it in the bill, for the satisfaction of people who have been critical of the university for having such a high degree of foreign, and particularly American professors, at the university, and also on the senate. As the bill went through the committee, in spite of my own protestations there are now no citizenship requirements for anyone serving on the senate.

That, as I say, is a personal dissatisfaction. But I think that all connected with the bill, citizens, faculty, board of governors, senate, the university president, including the minister, did co-operate in a very real fashion to bring this bill into its present form, and I am pleased to support it at second reading.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I have two comments on this bill, Mr. Speaker, one having to do with the composition of the board of governors. I would like to place on the record the thoughts set forth in volume called, "Towards Community in University Government," which was published by the University of Toronto Press in 1970, with a most notable number of commissioners having reached a consensus and a conclusion in this regard, which particularly affected the University of Toronto bill and situation. But it is equally applicable here and should be adverted to when bills of this kind come before the House.

By the way, I took some issue in committee, and wish to go on the record here, that a bill of this nature ought not to be before us at all. This comes as a private bill but universities are no longer private matters. They are financed overwhelmingly by public funds, and the matter should come through, as did the University of Toronto bill, by way of a public bill, with all the ramifications that that imports. The University of Waterloo should be in no different position touching the way and mode in which legislation is introduced and the auspices under which it comes.

The publication on "Towards Community" has this to say about the relative roles of different sectors of the community, including the university community, in its own governance.

> The future of the university as a community is based, as we have said, on mutual trust and respect, not on the absolute power of any one estate in the university. Power, authority and responsibility must be shared between the central structure of the departments, between faculty and students, between deans, chairmen and their councils, between academics and general support staff.
>
> Those who argue for the domination of any one estate over the rest threaten survival of the university. If, indeed, the university is to be controlled by its academic components, power should be shared. The strongest arguments for parity between faculty and students are based both on the student commitment to an interest in the learning process; and secondly, as well on very important political realities. Unless students feel secure in their influence and are indeed given considerable influence, participation becomes merely token.
>
> Our recommendations for departments call for joint student faculty negotiations to determine the actual makeup of councils and committees, because we consider this to be the fairest approach. The solution cannot be imposed by either students or faculty upon one another. If people are to live together, they must be able to agree on the basis of their relationship. Where negotiations are not feasible at the faculty level and above, we provide for parity in the representation of student and faculty as a right, with additional participation by academic and senior administration, lay people and alumni.
>
> Our recommendations at these levels provide for flexible student representation, from none at all to parity with elected faculty, depending upon the wishes of the students involved.

Now, the wishes of the students involved, insofar as the board of governors was concerned in this particular legislation, were fairly met; and so far as the senate is concerned, were not fairly met. I will admit to a period of fatigue in fighting against the

powers that be on section after section. It wears a man down after a period of time.

When we got to that particular section, for a moment I nodded, and didn't come forward in the students' interest. I wish to proclaim to the whole world, least of all this House, that in the future, on university bills, I am going to be for parity right down the line.

It seems to me no longer a merely dawning realization, but something that is not really in the cards either—something that must be fulfilled and given recognition to, particularly if the students evince any desire or willingness to participate in the on-going life of the university.

It finally ended up that the faculty were given 24 representatives and the students 18 as far as the University of Waterloo was concerned. The representation on the senate, which after all concerns the internal, academic, on-going life of the university with respect to curriculum and representation, gives the students seven representatives, which is simply not enough. For the nonce let us trust that it will work and give the basic initiative and introduction to the student body into the ways and means that operate within universities, with the possible flowering to take place before we all die.

The other matter that I want to mention is a matter of some crucial importance, which is either neglected or abnegated in every one of these university bills, including the University of Toronto Act; and it is high time we got into it and spoke about it. That is a problem that was brought forward, but not dwelt upon, during committee deliberations, and the real reason that I wish this matter to be brought before the House.

It has to do with due process; the whole concept, as the Americans call it, of due process. On my investigations, in speaking to parliamentary counsel I was never able, really, to thoroughly determine whether the certain legislation which you thumped your chests about and vaunted, rising out of the central core of McRuer, as to the protection of peoples' rights in the course of hearings, was applicable to the university community or not.

On spending some considerable time reading the definition sections, and the range and depth of the impact of the several pieces of legislation in this regard, what I am now referring to, in the first instance has to do with Bill 53, as it was in 1971: "An Act to Provide Procedures Governing the Exercise of Statutory Power Granted to Tribunals by the Legislature wherein the Rights, Duties and Privileges of Persons are to be Decided at or Following a Hearing."

Within the ambit of the University of Waterloo bill, particularly in the powers of the board of governors; particularly again set forth in subsection (e) of section 1 of section 15, it reads as follows:

> The board of governors has the power to regulate the conduct of the students, faculty and staff, and of all other persons coming upon, or using the lands and premises of the university.

Further down, in (g), it says:

> To levy and enforce penalties and fines, suspend or expell from student membership, or from employment within a university, to deny access to the lands and premises of the university.

From all those powers—very wide, quasi-judicial or actually judicial in their scope, with an enormous impact upon the lives and future of individuals within universities, students and faculty alike—there is no protection. This piece of legislation, that we went to such great trouble to enact, that is the Statutory Powers Procedure Act, in my opinion does not apply.

I would like to be proven wrong, or have it demonstrated that the Act has applicability to the hearings within the disciplinary and other bodies of the university. But my feeling is that that will not be possible. It applies to tribunals, and in perusing McRuer you will see the 15 to 25 different types of tribunals to which he thinks it ought to apply. Well, it didn't then apply.

But whether or not it was meant to apply to a wider range of quasi-governmental or actual government bodies, including universities, was not a point at issue at the time, and there is no word in the course of McRuer about this particular point. So I can only take it, on reading the definition, that the universities are admitted.

Thus, there isn't any process or any due regard to human rights—to proper hearing, to notices, to cross-examination, to who may be present and who may not, whether or not the hearings will be opened or closed, or what kind of evidence may be presented. It is the question of anybody—within what is supposed to be the most enlightened element within our civilization, but which remains at a primitive and almost foetus level so far as the development of the possibilities of the protection of human liberties are concerned; within the place that prates more

than any other institution in our society about the possibilities and necessity—living the reality of human freedom.

Isn't that an anomaly? Isn't that the strangest thing possible? That, in this institution that bends over backwards, as the member for Sarnia learned, and to which we accord complete autonomy. We won't even consider the possibility of programme financing to come before the Legislature, much less the business of being able to go into debt—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I was throttled by the whole system.

Mr. Lawlor: —with respect to the internal financing.

Right!

So there was a cut-off. Well, I don't go as strongly as the member for Sarnia with respect to being able to penetrate the veil. I think that perhaps the programme financing might be fine, that is the overall figures that govern particular areas within a university ought to be subject to question within the committee, and I think will in due course come to be so.

But the very niceties of the financing, I wouldn't want to interrogate. First of all, we haven't got the time. Secondly, you can upset the internal curriculum by too great a penetration—particularly if one fears the Fascist mentality operating inside universities coming from so-called elected representatives in this regard.

So I would leave them a fair scope to manoeuvre in, free of interference from this or any other body. But with respect to the governance of their own internal rights, surely they cannot abnegate, they cannot be bereft of, the internal procedures that apply to every other professional, quasi-government, or other major institution in our society, as through the agency of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act which we passed last year.

I will ask the minister to take due note and, by way of amendment of that Act, or by way of future amendment to the Universities Act, seek to include blanket amendments. This would be so that the internal hearings and procedures and all matters of discipline—faculty and student alike—within universities would be provided for, and that proper safeguards would be written into the law in this particular regard.

I don't say the same thing about Bill No. 54, which is called, in short form, Judicial Review Procedure Act. I think that is where *mandamus* proceedings used to be taken—*certiorari*—because of a mistake of law made by a tribunal, made by a hearing on the face of the record, or by mistakes of facts of certain kinds.

That's all been streamlined and made much more simple, all to the eternal benefit of the legal profession, bless them all, so that he can get on with the business of perusing the arbitrary acts of various forms of hearings. I think, I say, that that does apply.

But it's scant use to be able to take a matter up to the court of appeal, as is presently provided for. In other words, you have no record upon which to base it. Whereas Bill No. 53 provides for he making of a record and the maintaining of it, so that you see what went on; but since 53 doesn't apply, then 54 is rendered nugatory; it hasn't much—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member talking about Bill Pr5?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes; believe it or not.

Mr. Speaker: In what manner? I can't relate his comments to Bill Pr5 at all.

Mr. Foulds: You are the poorer for it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps you would stick to the contents only of Bill Pr5, in principle.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, if you come parading in here like a Latter-Day Saint, not able to follow the continuity of my reasoning—you couldn't expect me to make the whole speech off the cuff!

Mr. Speaker: I have great difficulty following you.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): It's a great Act!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Please, Pr5 in principle.

Mr. Lawlor: It's not so much what Bill 5 says, Mr. Speaker, as what it fails to say.

Mr. Speaker: Well, the hon. member may not speak on what is not in the bill.

Mr. Lawlor: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker; but having spoken I'll sit down.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I only have two comments on the bill.

Mr. Lawlor: You have got to wake up.

Mr. Renwick: Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the last committee hearing at which the bill was dealt with, and it may be that the points which I want to make are covered.

But I would draw to the minister's attention that one of the admirable features of this bill is that there is a specific reference not only in the powers of the board of governors, but the powers of the senate to the term "tenure." I would draw to the minister's attention that this is unique in the statutes governing the universities in the Province of Ontario. I had occasion to examine the statutes, trying to decide to what extent tenure was recognized within the framework of the governing statutes, and I find that there is no reference to tenure in the governing statutes of Brock University, Carleton, Guelph, the Lakehead, Laurentian, Toronto, Ottawa, Trent or Windsor; and that there is a reference to tenure, or to terms which can be construed as relating to tenure, in the bills governing the universities of York, Western and McMaster—and I believe, of Queen's University, but it is more difficult to go through the governing statutes of that ancient university to determine the extent to which tenure, as such, is recognized.

I am one of those who believes that tenure, subject to adequate policies enunciating and elaborating on the meaning of tenure, is an essential ingredient of the protection of the academic freedom of the universities. I distinguish, of course, Mr. Speaker, academic freedom from university autonomy and from the accountability of the university with respect to the disbursement of funds. Each of them is separate and distinct, and there is some tendency on occasion to confuse them. But I am speaking solely in this instance about academic freedom, and tenure is the basis and the cornerstone of the protection of the academic freedoms of the universities. I was concerned and shocked to find that there are so few of the governing statutes that have any relationship in their language to the grant of tenure and the terms and conditions of tenure.

I was extremely pleased to find in this bill that there is expressly given to the board of governors of the university not only the power to appoint, which of course is general throughout all of the statutes, but that there is a specific head of power which has this phraseology "to grant tenure to the members of faculty and to terminate tenure." And that in the powers of the senate of the university there is the correlative power to make recommendations to the board of governors with respect to various matters related to the university, including, amongst others, "to determine policies concerning the qualifications of faculty members within the university, with respect to appointments or promotions in rank, or to the granting of tenure in connection with research or teaching or academic administration."

Tenure is an ancient, almost feudal term, which tended to get lost in the development of the contractual relationship in law in our society. But tenure as it became known in the ancient universities is a concept which must, deserves and ought to be maintained as an essential ingredient of the universities as we understand them in the Province of Ontario.

I do not think it would be any intrusion by the government upon the autonomy of each of the universities in the province, for the Minister of Colleges and Universities to recommend to each of the universities that they give consideration in their own way—bearing in mind the uniqueness of each of these institutions—to bear in mind and to bring forward for consideration by the assembly amendments to their governing statutes providing for a recognition of tenure as an essential ingredient of academic freedom. And for a recommendation by the Minister of Colleges and Universities that the universities see to it that adequate statements of policies with respect to tenure, its meaning, extent and use, and to protect against its abuse and misuse, are essential ingredients also to the continuing life and spirit of the universities as we know them.

I think the minister may very well be aware that at Stanford University in California there has been a most fascinating case of the considerations which have to be dealt with in the case of a university professor who has tenure. After great concern, deliberation and procedural requirements, the faculty or the senate or the governing body at the University of Stanford did, in fact, exercise the discipline of removing tenure because of certain activities of that particular professor.

I would recommend to the minister's staff in his department that they study and concern themselves about the decision, the deliberations and the evidence that were given

in that particular case in order that they could get some idea of the kind of thing which I am talking about and which should be an essential ingredient of the governing policies of each of the universities in the Province of Ontario.

I welcome the very fact, as I said at the beginning, that this bill does recognize specifically—not hidden away but specifically in concrete terms—the fact that tenure exists in the universities and that the grant of tenure, the protection of tenure and the need for tenure is the basic ingredient of the academic freedom of the universities as we understand them. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the minister would also on occasion—as and when he believes that the period of infancy of the colleges of applied arts and technology is drawing to an end—consider establishing within the framework of the colleges of applied arts and technology as well a recognition of the need for some form of tenure with respect to the staffs and the faculty members of those colleges.

Tenure in those colleges also will have to become essential ingredients of the academic life of the province. If that is to be the case there must be the protection of tenure for faculty members in those colleges so that they will have the freedom which is an essential ingredient of the spirit of the kind of institution that the universities now are and should be and which, in my view, the colleges of applied arts and technology should become.

There is a second point that I would ask the minister to comment about. I don't understand it. This may have been covered in the committee and there may be some specific reason why it is not included in the University of Waterloo bill, but this is one of the few university statutes which does not have a relatively standard provision with respect to the fact that no religious test may be administered for the purpose of admission to the university as such.

I'm not talking about affiliated colleges which have religious overtones or denominations to them. My understanding is that Waterloo is a non-denominational university and I do not know why it doesn't have in it, as many of the other governing statutes have, the provision with respect to the fact that no religious test can be administered for the purpose of determining admission to the university on the one hand, and that there can be no requirement of obligatory attendance at religous observances.

I think the minister will be well aware that when the charter was granted to University College here, the first university in Upper Canada, as it then was, that that was one of the essential ingredients and was the result of a long, drawn-out fight as to whether or not the university would be non-denominational or whether it would be affiliated with the Church of England in Canada, as it was then known. All of us have been proud of the fact that the university tradition, for practical purposes in the Province of Ontario, has been a non-denominational one that no religious test could be administered for the purpose of entitling a person to become a member of the university as such, and the correlative part, that there could not be the imposition of any obligatory attendance on services of religious observance within the universities. I do not know why that provision is not in the University of Waterloo bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to repeat here the two points which we made on other occasions, other than to draw reference to them. I think that the time has come when the government has to accept the responsibility for these bills as public bills. We took the position that all of these bills, with respect to their governing structures, are public bills representing public institutions and should come forward as public bills of the Province of Ontario and not by way of private bill.

Perhaps riding a particular hobby horse of my own, I have not really been involved in the question of whether it should be unicameral or bicameral. I have not felt that was necessarily the be-all and end-all of the essential ingredient of restructuring the governance of the universities in the province.

I have, on the other hand, taken the view that it was a question related to the responsiveness and accountability of those who are elected to the governing bodies to their constituencies which have elected them which was the essential ingredient. From my point of view that fight, for practical purposes, is a continuing one. It has to be fought right from the very beginning, because there is no provision, for practical purposes, for the responsiveness or the accountability of elected members to the governing bodies of the universities, and there certainly is not in this bill.

There is provision, of course, for student representation, for faculty representation, and for public representation. However, there is certainly no obligation on those who are elected to represent the student body to meet with the student body, even so seldom as once a year, in order to be open to questioning and

to be required to give some explanation. This not for the purpose of subjecting them to any recall, but to provide for a public, open accountability and responsiveness of those students who are elected for the purpose of representing the student body on the governing bodies of the universities, so that they will be responsive to and in some sense accountable for and open to questions by members from the student body.

I would suggest perhaps that some other time the University of Waterloo might think it fit to adopt something called the university assembly concept, which in a certain form is available under the University of Western Ontario bill. It could well be carried forward from the point of view of its responsiveness to the student body of the elected members from the student body who sit on the board of governors and on other institutional structures within the universiy, either formal or informal.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I think in revamping the structure of this university some progress has been made, but I think there are basic and fundamental considerations still within the ambit of this minister with respect to the governing structures of the universities throughout the province, with respect to the governing structures of the colleges of applied arts and technology, which would indicate that we have only scratched the surface or moved a very small degree toward the kind of questions involved in the three keystones of universities and of the colleges. These are academic freedom on the one hand; university and college autonomy on the other hand; and accountability both to this Legislature with respect to the expenditure of funds, and accountability, within the ambit of university autonomy, of those who are elected as representatives to the various bodies to respond, to be available for, and to report to, those constituencies which elected them.

These are considerations where in the long run the government is going to have to give some indication of leadership. It can make suggestions and it can make recommendations without in any way being accused of intruding upon the autonomy of the post-secondary educational institutions of the Province of Ontario. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to the bill? Does the hon. minister wish to make any comments?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): A few short comments, Mr. Speaker. This bill, as the hon. members know, was quite thoroughly discussed in committee. There were some changes at that time. Some of them were quite substantial. There were changes in the representation on the board; there were changes rgarding expropriation powers, regarding citizenship and some changes in respect to the conduct of meetings.

I know that the particular subsection referred to by the hon. member for Lakeshore was discussed quite thoroughly.

The student representatives there, of course, had something to say about double jeopardy. I felt, however, that the committee, and not particularly any specific party representation in that committee, had voted in a similar way because of the rather unique situation in dealing with a university and a university community and the necessity for some powers in the university to regulate the conduct of students, separate and apart from whatever civil or criminal regulations may be in effect generally.

The president and representatives of the university there, including some of the faculty, had indicated—I know this is not an argument—that there had not been any injustice in this regard in the past. This was a repeat, basically, of the provision that was in the existing bill. The students admitted that this was so. And I think that in today's operation of the various campuses that some, at least, of the power asked for here was not unreasonable.

I agree that, certainly as far as hearings and proceedings are concerned, every institution, including universities, should adhere to the principles as set out by McRuer; and I wonder really if this is in conflict with McRuer!

I noticed the remarks of the hon. member for Riverdale regarding tenure. I am frankly surprised that this provision is not in the new University of Toronto Act. I had thought it was.

However, we are having certain problems with one or two universities, and with at least one community college regarding the lack of specific reference in respect to tenure and I would think that the same provisions that we have in this bill could apply eventually to the community colleges.

Regarding future legislation; the hon. member for Lakeshore referred to this early during the committee proceedings that in future legislation dealing with universities should in fact be brought forth by the govern-

ment. I think the reason at the present time is because of no decision, really, as to whether or not these institutions should be by bicameral or unicameral. As the hon. members know, with the University of Toronto the new legislation provides for a one governing body. However this is not as yet in effect. We want to know how that works out; and then we will have a definite policy regarding the structure of the government of the university. I would think that in future, legislation will in fact be brought forth by the government rather than by the institutions themselves by way of private bills.

Regarding the exclusion of any type of religious tests, Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that the Act is silent on this does not necessarily make it possible for the institution to provide these tests. If the institution is to be public, or quasi-public, from the point of view of receiving provincial support, it has to adhere to the principles of a public institution, in that it is open and it doesn't require any reference to religious affiliation, or religious tests, or any type of a instruction or requirement in that regard as far as advancement or the obtaining of credits or a degree are concerned.

Mr. Renwick: But it is a significant omission when you compare it with other universities.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, I am not sure of such a provision existing in other Acts dealing with universities. This is a point that wasn't raised.

Mr. Renwick: It does; and that was the point raised.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I wonder what the charter would provide. I would think that the charter itself would provide some reference to this before the institution could, in fact, qualify for public support. I know they were going to require this of the University of Waterloo Lutheran; and I would think that possibly in some other context there is reference to this.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr 5, An Act respecting the University of Waterloo.

Mr. Lawlor: Just one word Mr. Speaker! In regard to the due process provision, whatever the minister may have said, that it was no argument; it certainly was no argument. The minister should give good consideration to what I have said about this matter.

MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 86, An Act to amend the Ministry of Community and Social Services Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Just a few comments, Mr. Speaker. I discussed the bill with the minister and have some knowledge of the intent. I would like to just look at that section 2, though, for a moment, with the minister, wherein it relates to consultation, research, the evaluation services, with respect to programmes of social services for the provision, encouragement and development of credit counselling services and community development.

As one goes through the department's records, and so on, Mr. Minister, one gets the impression of great things being done in these lines of consultative services and in community development. Yet you look at the estimates and see the small amount of money for community development, and you have what occurred in Sudbury last year when the community development branch held a meeting there, and at the end of the day there was a resolution passed that such a conference would not be held in the Sudbury area again.

This isn't community development. I guess that is what I am saying. There aren't enough funds. I am hopeful that the type of grants you are going to provide for community development will be adequate for community development—not merely a bunch of conferences around the province which seem to be doing something, but which in fact lead to no positive action on the recommendations that are made at any of these conferences.

This is what the feeling was in Sudbury and I know from speaking to people in other areas it is the same there. You get all these nice resolutions for some form of action and nothing is done. You know, the people get a little fed up. I would hope that under this section, which gives the minister the power

which he had previously but also gives him the power to make grants, that we make the grants substantial. I hope we make that section of his department meaningful so that in fact we have real community development.

With respect to the credit counseling services, again this appears to me to be more of a mess. As you go around the province in the various offices of this department you don't find anyone there with the expertise for credit counseling. The man who does it in Sudbury, at my request, is a member of the faculty of Cambrian College—a man by the name of Bert Ziegler. The department doesn't have people to assist in credit counseling.

In fact if you look at the research portion, and I've requested this on a good number of occasions to the minister's predecessors, credit counseling as I'm told by the minister's own people and other people working in the field, could resolve a lot of marriage breakdowns.

I've asked for a study to determine what percentage of marriage breakdowns results from extending credit and monetary problems. I'm told it is a substantial number. Yet the department to my knowledge does not go into the research field to determine just how many marriages are affected and how many times these problems lead to marriage breakdowns.

The minister has got these powers; I hope he uses them.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to the bill? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, in item section 2, the main purpose is to provide legislative authority whereby we can share in the federal contribution. I listened with great interest to the hon. member's remarks. I'd like to mention to him that our grants for research this year are substantially increased. I believe there is $600,000 in this year's estimates, compared to $100,000 last year, I believe.

The comments he has made about family credit counseling and so forth are certainly very worthwhile and we hope to do more in that area.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 134, An Act to amend the Charitable Institutions Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is that the one that is not printed?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, it is printed.

Mr. Speaker: Is the bill in fact printed?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 134. The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the member who occupied the chair previous to you and the arbitrary fashion with which he ruled when I tried to raise a question, I was almost tempted to ask that this bill be stood down. We didn't have time to go over the bill very carefully in view of the fact we have just received it.

However, the main principle of the bill as I see it in section 8, is "the extended care service may be made available in a charitable institution to a person eligible therefor under the Health Insurance Act." Because this is such an important principle involved, we in this party are not going to ask the bill be stood down, but rather that it get second reading.

We are going to support the bill. We think it involves a goodly number of people and it is to the benefit of those less fortunate than ourselves. We join with the minister in his bringing forward this bill and I might as well say it, we will do exactly the same with the next bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate? If not, does the hon. minister have any comments?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

HOMES FOR THE AGED AND REST HOMES ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 135, An Act to amend the Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

RIDING HORSE ESTABLISHMENTS

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 129, An Act to regulate Riding Horse Establishments.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): This is a new bill. The minister and I have been sharing the same sources of information this afternoon.

Mr. Renwick: I thought it was the same horse!

Mr. Gaunt: Well, perhaps in some cases that's true too.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Don't buy a gift horse, buy a new one.

Mr. Gaunt: In any case, I support this bill. I think it is a bill which should assist the riding stables across the province and make them more uniform with respect to the quality of service which they offer. I have had a number of complaints over the years about some of these operations—not many, mind you, but some. I have noted that on some occasions some of the animals which are used in these riding stables are not of the highest quality. Many of them are real bone horses, if you can call them that. They are nothing but skin and bone and I often wonder exactly where they come from.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Or where they are going! We have got a meat inspection amendment, too, haven't we?

Mr. Gaunt: Many of the sections are the same as the PMU bill which the minister introduced last year, I guess it was. There are a number of additional sections which apply to the particular operation with which we are dealing. I gather the humane society had some comments in this regard. I think it was brought on by complaints and by investigations which it had carried out. This resulted in the presentation of a brief and I think some of the ideas contained in the brief submitted to the minister are actually embodied in the bill itself. There is one interesting part and I pass it along to the minister. I notice that with increasing frequency we are establishing various licensing review boards. I think the minister must have close to a dozen by now. I have never really counted them up but—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Just two.

Mr. Gaunt: Just two? I think he has got more than that, with respect. I will count them up. The point I was going to make was that on the establishment of the riding horse establishment licence review board—that's quite a handle—I wonder, in view of the fact that there are a number of bills—I can think of the PMU bill! There is a licence review board there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It would be the same board for these two bills.

Mr. Gaunt: It would be the same board for the two bills?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Gaunt: That was the point I was going to make. I was going to suggest to the minister that perhaps the personnel of those boards—not only the two boards in question, but perhaps a number of other boards—could be interchangeable and, in fact, could be the same people because I think most would be fairly knowledgeable about these things. They are all agriculturally oriented. People who have a background in agriculture, I would think, could sit on all of these review boards and do an equally capable job.

The minister is setting out the conditions related to facilities and premises and so on. Many of the things which he intends to do are going to be done by regulation. In other words, the real power will be in the regulations.

Under section 15, the general terms are set out and in section 13 the absence of horses from a particular stable is dealt with. That section is a new section in the bill. It's different in that respect from the PMU bill.

I don't think I have much else to say about the bill, Mr. Speaker. Other than we support it. I think it's a good procedure. I think it will increase the quality of service to the public and it will weed out the unscrupulous operators. I don't think we have many, but we have a few as in everything. To that extent it will be for the betterment of everyone concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, we will support the bill. Perhaps the minister will let me in on a secret. He must have someone in his department who prepares these bills because the bills of the minister are usually very complete and very thorough. I have a feeling that there must be some lawyer in the minister's own department rather than with the Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Gaunt: He's got three of them.

Mr. Renwick: Well, whoever it is has imbibed in the bills not only the technicalities but I think the spirit of what Mr. Justice McRuer was trying to say. I noticed that on other occasions and I notice it again now. I would suggest to the minister, and this is a comment which we made when the tile drainage bill was before us earlier, that this is exactly the kind of licensing arrangement from which in a relatively short period of time—after the establishments have become used to the fact that they have got to abide by certain rules and regulations and have become accustomed to it—the minister should give serious consideration to moving on in an evolutionary way to a grant of self government to the riding horse establishment operators in the Province of Ontario, to provide a body and a framework which would require compulsory membership in such a body, but to grant them in turn very wide areas of self-policing and self-government, which seems to me in the long run to be a much preferable method rather than to have the continuous intrusion of government into these establishments.

I think the same result would be achieved and I think it would be a worthwhile evolution of this kind of regulation of these bodies. I know that the government has in fact proliferated these licence review boards —though this minister may not very well have. I am suggesting that there is an alternative. The alternative is establishing by statute a self-governing body and requiring membership and allowing that body to govern itself subject to an overall minimal control with respect to standards by the government. I think that we have experience of that in the professional field and I don't see why it is not an adaptable form of evolutionary policy by this government in the case of establishments such as this.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to the bill? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the favourable comments that have been made concerning the bill. We think that it is a useful piece of legislation and that it will perform a very useful function.

With regard to any specific points that have been raised, first of all, by the member for Huron Bruce, with regard to the licence review board, it will be the same personnel as that on the PMU board. After all, we are dealing with horses and these men are knowledgeable in both cases. So there will be no duplication of personnel there.

I agree with him that the request for regulation for the riding establishments has been drawn to our attention by several groups, not the least of which was the Ontario Humane Society in making a request for some type of regulation to be provided. There have been several of the horse societies themselves which have drawn the matter to our attention that there should be a type of regulation and they support the bill very much at the present time.

With regard to the comments made by the member for Riverdale, I appreciate very much what he said concerning our lawyers who have drafted the bill. They are sitting here on my left. I have difficulty at times in understanding their legal terminology, I must confess, but they are educating me as time goes on.

Mr. Gaunt: I don't have any trouble with them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, that shows the difference, you see. If you had met them 10 years ago you would have been in awful trouble, but now they talk in layman's language that I can understand, and they have moved away from that terminology which sometimes confuses me,

Mr. Renwick: It is the other way around. You are talking more and more like a lawyer.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: So I appreciate what they have done and I am very fortunate indeed to have a staff like that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That takes the place of a raise!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As to the matter concerning the self-governing powers for the establishments of riding horse operators I think there is a lot of merit in that suggestion. But I don't think that group is organized as yet. Perhaps sometime they will be.

But when they are, then I think we can move toward the suggestion made by the member for Riverdale. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

DEAD ANIMAL DISPOSAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 130, An Act to amend the Dead Animal Disposal Act.

Mr. Gaunt: Very few comments on this one, Mr. Speaker. It is just a tightening up of the Act really. There are a number of places here where the Act refers to the broker. I gather this just brings the brokers under the terms of the Act. The collector can sell to a rendering plant, the rendering plant can then sell to the broker and the broker can sell to the pet food manufacturer. Now, in the Act, I believe, the broker is prevented from dealing with the collector; he can only deal with the rendering plant. That is the way it should be.

There is another section related to advertising. Here again I gather that, as in several sections, it is a matter of housekeeping —the Act has been tightened up to include, in this instance, any person. I think the Act before was drafted in such a way that any person who was licensed could be dealt with. But any person who wasn't licensed didn't come under the terms of the Act. And so, in the drafting of this particular piece of legislation, the department has covered that particular loophole. That's all I have to say about the bill. We support it.

Mr. Speaker: Any other comments? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, we considered the bill in caucus in detail this morning. We are going to support the bill. We think that it is a very useful provision that the collector should dispose of dead animals only to the licensed plants. I for one didn't know that that was not already contained in the bill until we had an opportunity to consider it this morning.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did the member for Lakeshore agree?

Mr. Renwick: We also support the extension of the bill to those who are brokers in the trade and business.

Again, I think that the bill merits our support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the member for Lakeshore was wholly in favour. He was, in fact, the advocate in caucus.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have any comments?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 86, An Act to amend the Ministry of Community and Social Services Act.

Bill 129, An Act to regulate Riding Horse Establishments.

Bill 130, An Act to amend the Dead Animal Disposal Act.

Bill 134, An Act to amend the Charitable Institutions Act.

Bill 135, An Act to amend the Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act.

ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORP. ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves second reading of Bill 115, An Act to amend the Ontario Development Corp. Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a very few brief comments to make on this bill.

We are a little concerned on this side about the kind of discretion that the minister, I would imagine, is going to have when he introduced the bill a few weeks ago. He indicated that the reason for the bill, and the following Bill 116, An Act to amend the Northern Ontario Development Corp., was to give the local managers, or regional managers, more discretion in making loans. I gather that this is primarily the purpose of the bill.

We would hope that before we have a vote on second reading, Mr. Speaker, that the minister will rise in his place and give us the parameters with which we're dealing. I don't think any of us, in this House, are prepared to see the complete open-ended programme that this bill, and the following bill, seem to be indicating.

Subsection 3 and subsection 2 give the minister, in effect, the complete open-ended programme, dealing with millions of dollars to dispense with in his own way and in his own time. If nothing else, I would like to draw to the minister's attention, and ask him to go back to, the McRuer commission on civil rights. I would ask the minister to refresh his memory, perhaps over the dinner hour, as to what was contained therein, in volume 1 I believe, in regard to legislative and delegative authority.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was volume 3.

Mr. Reid: Volume 3?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): I read it this afternoon.

Mr. Reid: Really, the minister is coming before us with a double-barreled approach here: first, in that he is asking for abnormal discretion, I would think, in that he hasn't given the parameters in regard to this bill; secondly, that we are being asked, Mr. Speaker, to give carte blanche to a complete open-ended programme. The only parameters on it are really the funds that are passed in the budget. What other control do we have, or does the Legislature have, over the funds?

Hon. Mr. White: Read the bill.

Mr. Reid: Well, there is nothing that indicates in the bill what these limits are going to be. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is moving the responsibility from the Lieutenant Governor in Council—the cabinet—to the hon. minister. He will now have that responsibility for having these things passed by regulations, which supposedly will be set at some future time. It has not been consistent with this government's activities in the past few years to have its regulations prepared at the same time the legislation is prepared. You are asking us to come and give you this carte blanche. That is the purpose of the bill.

The minister doesn't nod, or shake his head. Or perhaps he is wondering what the purpose of the bill is. We would like to know. We would like to know what is going to happen to this money, and how much the limits are going to be, and what is left to the discretion of the local manager? I rose during the minister's estimates, and I complained about the fact that getting the actual money or the loans into the hands of people who applied for them was taking much too long a time. I would hope that this bill is going to go some way to correcting that situation.

Hon. Mr. White: That's the idea.

Mr. Reid: Right, but there also have to be certain limits on just who is going to be responsible for the money that is being expended. All the bill says is that it's going to be done by regulation rather than Lieutenant Governor in Council. Quite frankly, I'm not so sure that I'm prepared to accept that. I couldn't do that and still accept the responsibility that I have as a member of the Legislature for the funds that are being expended by this body.

The minister, when he introduced the bill, did not give much of an explanation as to how, or by what method, this was going to be done, other than to say that it would speed up the loans. The last section of the bill guarantees that an annual report will be laid before the legislative assembly in the first sitting after the fiscal year, I believe it is. Well, by that time, it's almost a little too late.

We would like to have a little more specific information on the bill before we decide to give our complete approval to it. I don't think it's fair to us, nor can we carry out our responsibilities by acceding to something like this. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the minister can indicate, first of all, how these loans will gain cabinet approval, or approval by regulation. Secondly, how much money will be lent at the discretion of the local managers? Thirdly, what discretion does the minister retain, and over what amount?

It's my understanding, through my reading of the bill, that all responsibility passes from the cabinet, to something to be set up sometime, somewhere, by regulation. I would hope that before the vote is put, the minister will explain these matters.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I think in this party we are prepared to speak on this bill, as well as 116. They are dealing with the same matters. I think our comments would apply to both of them. I would also

like the minister to explain whether or not the executive committee he is doing away with was really ever tried, and why he decided to take that out of the legislation as well.

It being 6 of the clock, perhaps I could adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary to adjourn the debate. Will there be other speakers on this bill?

Some hon. members: Yes.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 25, 1972

Kindergarten teaching qualifications, statement by Mr. Wells 2763

Introduction of Coroners Act, statement by Mr. Yaremko 2764

Metric conversion, statement by Mr. White 2765

Refusal of hospital privileges, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis 2766

Conflict of interest, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2767

OHC waiting list, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. B. Newman 2767

New community of North Pickering, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Deans 2769

Study of performance loan programme, question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 2770

Provincial enumeration for assessment purposes, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Burr 2771

Forgivable loan obligations, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 2771

French version of Ontario theme song, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Roy 2772

Ontario Place liquor licences, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Shulman 2772

Auditor General's report, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Singer 2773

Hamilton harbour landfill, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deans 2773

Pollution on farms, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. W. Newman, Mr. MacDonald 2774

Arnprior dam, question of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Roy 2775

Fire in OHC building, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Timbrell 2775

List of private investigators, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Bounsall 2775

Automobile prices, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Reid 2775

Union Savings and Loan Association, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Shulman 2776

Fire regulations for treatment centres, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Deacon 2776

Claims against OHIP for blood tests, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Timbrell 2776

Ontario Place uniforms, question of Mr. White: Mr. Germa 2777

Presenting reports, Health Services Insurance Plan and Cancer Institute, Mr. Potter 2777

Presenting report, standing administration of justice committee, Mr. Clement 2777

Regional Municipality of York Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 2778

Raising Money on Credit of Consolidated Revenue Fund, bill to authorize, Mr. McKeough, first reading 2778

Coroners Act, 1972, bill intituled, Mr. Yaremko, first reading 2778

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Potter, first reading 2778

Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, Mr. Potter, first reading 2779

Meat Inspection Act, Ontario, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 2779

Aircraft operation and sonic boom investigation and control, bill to regulate, Mr. Shulman, first reading 2780

Third readings 2780

Ministry of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, second reading 2780

Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, second reading 2782

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, second reading 2783

Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, second reading 2786

Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, second reading 2787

University of Waterloo, bill respecting, Mr. Good, second reading 2795

Third reading 2802

Ministry of Community and Social Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2802

Charitable Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2803

Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, second reading 2803

Riding horse establishments, bill to regulate, Mr. Stewart, second reading 2804

Dead Animal Disposal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading 2806

Third readings 2806

Ontario Development Corporation Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, on second reading 2806

Recess, 6 o'clock 2808



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 71



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, May 25, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1972

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, before we start proceedings, I am sure the hon. members will join me in wishing greetings to the First Applewood B" Scout Group of Applewood Acres, Mississauga, who are with us this evening.

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): Where is that?

Mr. Speaker: May I say too, according to my information, in both galleries we have people from the Scarborough East Progressive Conservative Association.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order, second reading of Bill 115, An Act to amend the Ontario Development Corp. Act.

ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORP. ACT

(*continued*)

Mr. Speaker: When we recessed at the supper hour we were dealing with second reading of Bill 115.

The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid) had finished his remarks. Does any other hon. member wish to speak to the bill?

Does the hon. minister (Mr. White) have any comments? The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well I—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): This should be very good.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It will be one of his better ones.

Mr. Lewis: I would think I can summon myself to make a contribution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This is an Act to amend the Ontario Development Corp.—

Mr. Lewis: I am quite aware of that, Mr. Speaker, I have observed that.

When we were about to adjourn at the dinner hour after the questions which were raised by the member for Rainy River—I shall be quite frank with the minister—some of my colleagues and I were discussing whether or not this bill should, in fact, be supported.

We had pretty well decided to support it with acute reservations at the point at which it originally was introduced. But I don't know. We want to hear the minister. But after the answer which the minister gave in question period today, we wondered whether or not the bill should be supported at all, on any grounds.

Mr. Speaker, let me review it for you. This is a bill which gives the minister carte blanche; unilateral authority; authority of such status that already autograph seekers surround him; authority to make unilaterally, decisions on performance loans—

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): That is wrong.

Mr. Lewis: Then correct me if I'm wrong—decisions on venture capital loans, decisions on conventional loans, decisions on all the various loans that have been made possible by Acts which fall within his ministry.

It's unilateral in the sense that the area of ministerial discretion is notably enlarged. It is no longer necessary to have an order-in-council passed and printed. He now, by way of regulation as we understand it, has the authority to make loans of no particular delimitation in size, and no particular delimit in terms. One of the subsections removes the time limit on the forgivable portion, at least, of the forgivable loans.

Mr. Speaker, this seems an extraordinary authority to give to any ministry, under any circumstances. Surely it should not be something which one reads in an annual report published by the Ontario Development Corp. at year's end. Surely it should be something which one can trace from day to day, the terms of which are known and under public scrutiny. This will not necessarily now be the case.

I asked the minister at question period about the DREE situation in the federal House and whether or not he had made a similar study about the appropriateness or

inappropriateness of performance loans in Ontario. He said, if memory serves me—and before second reading passes I shall try to reinforce memory with instant Hansard—he said something to the effect that it had never been fully demonstrated that a performance loan, or an EIO loan, really determined the location of a given plant or industry and that fact was something that was difficult to prove, or difficult to assess, or difficult to relate.

Well, look Mr. Speaker, you recall the whole rationale for the EIO programme, introduced with such extraordinary fanfare, largely by the Hon. Stanley Randall when he was a member of this House; and pursued by the present Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) as this minister's predecessor. The whole raison d'être of that programme was to use the performance loans as a key for directing industry, so it was alleged, to underdeveloped areas of Ontario. It was forever the argument of the New Democratic Party and the official opposition that there couldn't, in fact, be a correlation between that; what, in fact, this government was doing in a consistent fashion was giving money to firms that would have located in their intended destinations anyway. It was an unconscionable extension of public funds.

I remember my colleague from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) making the case about Allied Chemical in the Sudbury basin, which had to locate there to use a sulphur dioxide process. One wondered where else in the province it could have located except in the Sudbury basin. But for that purpose the government of Ontario gave them a lavish forgivable loan.

One remembers Kraft Foods in the eastern part of Ontario that received half-a-million dollars by way of a forgivable loan to locate in the only part of the province that it then could have located in, in order to have a viable economic operation. One wondered what possible justification there was for giving away half-a-million dollars of the public money to a multi-national corporation to do what it fully intended to do without the additional incentive from this government.

Instance after instance piled up, Mr. Speaker, of numbers of jobs not having been met; of irregular and unplanned location of industry throughout Ontario; of incentives to companies that obviously didn't need the incentives; for whom the investment was in tens-of-millions of dollars; and for whom the extra half-million served merely as a way to larder corporate profit rather than seriously to require location in a given part of the province.

And the funds mounted up in quantity. If I recall, within the last year they had reached a figure substantially over $20 million, given to multi-national corporations that had plant extensions or new plant locations in the Province of Ontario. We fought the issue bitterly, Mr. Speaker. And time and time again, we made the points with the minister's predecessors that this was a gratuitous handout to corporations who didn't need it.

It was, in fact, having a positively negative effect in Ontario because of the way in which we were dotting the landscape indiscriminately with this industry or that industry, whose life might be four or five years; but about which industry there was no assurance that it would fit into an overall regional plan or that it would have persistent economic growth.

My former colleague from Peterborough, Walter Pitman, did a demolition job on one occasion on the previous Minister of Trade and Industry in demonstrating how badly the EIO programme had served the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Yakabuski: He did such a good demolition job, he demolished himself.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Because you had more money than he did.

Mr. Lewis: When Stanley Randall was challenged, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that there was some relationship between the performance loans granted and the location of the industries, he even invoked, if memory serves me, a management consultant's report to try to show some correlation. Today in the house the current Minister of Industry and Tourism suggests that correlation is indeed difficult to determine.

Well, he's right, it's difficult to determine. It never was actually determined. This was always a programme designed to provide, without adequate justification, specific grants of money to the corporate sector.

And so there came from the opposition parties, Mr. Speaker, a number of alternative proposals. We said to the minister's predecessors: "Cut out your performance loan programme—it's a stupid way to spend public money. If you want to direct industry into underdeveloped areas of the province, then do it by the development of services rather than by handouts of public funds."

At least if you provide services, you provide an infrastructure to which service industries from the public sector can be attached rather than to give away to a multinational corporation. That was laughed at and discarded by the government because it wouldn't be a sufficient inducement to bring the location of industry.

Then when the bill was amended last year—I'm working from memory—my colleague from Sudbury East moved the amendment to say, "At least if you're going to give away this money, give it to Canadian corporations instead of multi-national corporations." That amendment was defeated because the spirit of the Conservative government at the time was that they were not prepared to give special support to Canadian industry—although the Premier (Mr. Davis) falls over himself day in and day out making public utterances about confidence in the Canadian sector of the economy. But when challenged to do something about it under this programme, it was repudiated by the government.

The government was sorely and acutely embarrassed—again working from memory—by the series of articles which appeared under the name of Ross Munro, now Washington correspondent for the Globe and Mail. He wrote, much to the embarrassment of the branch and the present Minister of Revenue, a series of special articles, revealing the checkerboard approach of the EIO loan programme; how questionable it was; how difficult it was to justify; how difficult it was to find information; how little it had done in terms of economic planning for the province, calling into question the entire programme—the entire programme.

It was not, in any sense, adequately defended because the minister knew then, just as the Hon. Stanley Randall knew, what the Minister of Industry and Tourism said this afternoon—that it is very difficult indeed to establish a relationship between the money you give by way of performance loan and the location of the industry.

Well, Mr. Speaker, because that was the rationale for the entire programme, it's very difficult to support this kind of bill because you've got nothing left on which to rest your case.

How do you come into this Legislature and ask for authority to do all the things which the member for Rainy River indicated you will now do yourself, or through cabinet, without being subject to a public scrutiny, without even having the basic premise left which was at least that the money would attract industry, allegedly, into certain areas?

Now you yourself call that into question. My colleagues at the time, said: "Oh, how disarming the minister is. Oh, how he speaks, so frankly and with such candour." That was a very neat throwaway line. In one quiet, throwaway line, he demolished the rationale for a programme, not to mention having demolished his predecessors who have advocated exactly the opposite from 1967 to this day—

Mr. Renwick: The minister nods; I think he does, I think he's nodding.

Mr. Lewis: And I think the programme was introduced, wasn't it, on the eve of the provincial election in 1967?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): I am rocking in my chair, I am not nodding.

Mr. Renwick: With great difficulty, you're controlling your nods.

Mr. Lewis: The programme was introduced on the eve of the provincial election in 1967 by the Hon. John Robarts in the city of Thunder Bay in order to provide special jobs and incentives for the north. You've never paid any serious attention to the north under the Ontario Development Corp.—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is straying somewhat from the subject.

Mr. Lewis: Somewhat, but I'm bringing myself right back. I'm riveting right back to the principle—

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member will just circle back.

Mr. Lewis: It turned out that the programme then served purely the location of industry in parts of southern Ontario, under questionable means. Well, I now have the Hansard and I want to—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Put it on the record.

Mr. Lewis: —put it on the record.

Mr. Renwick: In context this time.

Mr. Lewis: But this time it won't be one of those little larks that the Minister of Industry and Tourism has from time to time.

Mr. MacDonald: His mischievous moments.

Mr. Lewis: That's right, the sort of mischievous asides that he hopes no one will pick up. I asked the question of the minister, Mr. Speaker.

> Has there been any study at any time of the performance loan programme in Ontario equivalent to the Harvard study that is now public of the federal DREE programme?

A study which demonstrated that in 11 out of 18 industries which were analysed, the money served to swell the profits of the corporations involved rather than to act as legitimate incentives for location or the creation of jobs.

The hon. minister said:

> I am not aware of any formal study and in fact I think it is impossible to determine accurately whether or not these incentives are productive.

Stanley Randell would have collapsed in his seat had he thought such words would come from a cabinet minister.

Mr. Singer: Stanley Randall—

Mr. Lewis: The minister simply repudiates the entire argument which justified the government programme until today.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: He also said:

> This is one of the reasons I posed the question to the Legislature during the estimates, whether or not we should be in the performance loan business at all.

Fair enough. Then he said the companies that come to ODC and to this department say:

> "If you give us a sum of money called a performance loan we will locate this plant there." There is no way of proving before or after the fact whether this grant of money had a bearing on their decision to locate or not locate.

It is like a surreal fantasy. For five years the Legislature has been told that the determinant of the location was the grant. The minister's predecessors had been absolutely unequivocal that that's what determined the location.

For the minister to walk in now and, in an aside to the question period, call into question the whole programme is really quite something! How he can ask us to support a bill which gives him the authority to grant loans which he cannot himself justify seems to me to be a very difficult request for us to respond to.

Mr. MacDonald: Rather presumptuous.

Mr. Lewis: I think that we are moving ourselves—we are waiting to hear the minister's reply—but our very strong inclination is that it would be a profound mistake to support this bill on second reading because it is giving him the right to perpetuate an irresponsible programme which he himself has now repudiated.

Mr. Singer: Does the member agree the federal government—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think by the time I have offered the explanations required and the elaborations requested, the members of the Legislature will give this bill their full support.

Let me deal with the several changes being suggested in this legislation. The maximum number of directors of the corporation is increased from nine to 13. The intention, very simply, is to get a more heterogeneous and larger number of clever men and women who have some financial expertise, who are familiar with different industries and come from different parts of the province. I expect there will no objection to that.

The second change has to do with the elimination of the executive committee. In the past a three-man executive committee was permitted under the Act. although never utilized. This three-man executive committee under the old legislation had all the power of the board itself. To vest that much power in a small number of members of the board, the so-called executive committee, seemed to my officials to be unwise. I was glad, therefore, having comprehended the argument to recommend it to my colleagues in cabinet and this is the change recommended now to the Legislature by the executive.

The third section is the one that is giving particular trouble here today and I would like to explain it, if I may.

I don't know if it is perfectly true or not, but I was told by a northern businessman not long ago that to get $100,000 loan he had to get 21 approvals. I do know it is true that in order to get a loan of $1,000, or of any amount, full approval has to be

given by the Ontario Development Corp. board and approval has to be given by the cabinet of Ontario.

Can one visualize any lending institution acting in this way?

Mr. Renwick: Yes, the chartered banks.

Hon. Mr. White: No, the chartered banks in fact devolve power to their managers, and each manager has—

Mr. Singer: Oh come on.

Mr. Lewis: Don't be silly, this is an outright grant.

Mr. Renwick: Ask about the loans to the farm community.

Hon. Mr. White: All right now. There is absolutely no change in the requirements with respect to performance loans. That is not changed in any way. If a five-cent piece—

Mr. Lewis: Sure it is, it is in your bill.

Hon. Mr. White: If a five-cent piece is given to a company, that must be approved by the full cabinet of Ontario. It is only in the case of repayable loans that we propose to devolve power from the cabinet to the board of the ODC.

Mr. Lewis: But you have got it in writing. The repeal removes the time limits for forgiving a loan. The bill deals with the forgiveness loans. It gives you authority you should not have in that programme.

Hon. Mr. White: Every performance loan of whatever size and regardless of conditions, every performance loan, must in the future, as in the past, be approved by the full board of the ODC and by the cabinet of Ontario by order-in-council. So that it's not changed at all.

Mr. Renwick: That is not what the bill says.

Mr. Lewis: You had better read the bill you introduced.

Mr. Singer: Why don't you read the legislation?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, let me continue my exposition and then you can decide how to vote.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. members should let the minister complete his comments.

Hon. Mr. White: The changes being recommended in this particular bill make it possible for the government to devolve power to the board itself and from the board to officials of the board, within constraints to be established by the government as a whole by means of regulation. The intention is to devolve power to the maximum amount of $100,000 initially. As the board and its officials in the head office here in Toronto, and to be located in regional offices across the province, gain experience in this new degree of freedom to increase that $100,000 progressively to something larger than that.

Mr. Lewis: You are wrong. You are wrong in your interpretation of the legislation.

Hon. Mr. White: No, I am not wrong.

Mr. Lewis: Yes you are, it is absolutely clear.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is very seldom that one has to correct this particular minister, but item (c) of the Ontario Development Corp. Act in chapter 308, section 8(1) (c) provides "and forgive the repayment of the loan". One of the provisions of the bill is to repeal the instances where approvals of the Lieutenant Governor in Council are required or delegated to be prescribed by regulation. At the present time an order in council is required to forgive the repayment of the loan and one of the purposes of the bill is to eliminate that requirement.

If the minister doesn't understand his bill I suggest we stand it down, Mr. Speaker, until he has an opportunity to consider it.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, let me repeat. This bill will remove certain existing constraints. For instance, it will remove the requirement that every loan of every kind be approved by the full board and by the cabinet by way of an order-in-council. It removes the formulation which was imposed by statute.

Mr. Lewis: No, you are wrong.

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with respect, Mr. Minister—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Can a point of order be debated?

Mr. Lewis: You can't be debating a clause giving an interpretation of a clause which is so clearly an incorrect interpretation. What's the point of debating? If you don't like the clause, stand it down and change it.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I must say to the hon. member this cannot be a point or order.

Hon. Mr. White: We are into authority out of Canada and I think perhaps we should put it before the committee, because I know that I am not mistaken in the advice given to me by my officials in an intensive briefing session and I am perfectly satisfied that the wording accomplishes the purposes described to me. Now, Mr. Speaker, can we debate this principle and can we perhaps put this bill into committee, where members of the opposition will have an opportunity to discuss the details of the wording?

Mr. Lewis: We certainly will.

Hon. Mr. White: The changes being recommended in this part of this bill will enable the government to devolve power to the Ontario Development Corp. board and will enable, subject to constraints to be created in regulation, power from the board to officers of the board. The lending limits to be thus established parallel the model of private financial institutions and parallel the existing arrangements for the Industrial Development Bank.

Mr. Lewis: But it doesn't say that. It says, "removes the limits."

Hon. Mr. White: It establishes the limits by regulation.

Mr. Lewis: It doesn't. It says you will remove the limits. And you won't tell us what the limits will be.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, we will have to get into that in committee of the whole.

Mr. Lewis: When are you going to give us the regulations?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, almost immediately.

Mr. Lewis: Well, what are the limits on the loans?

Hon. Mr. White: The regulation will require every performance loan to be approved by the cabinet.

Mr. Lewis: What are the limitations on the loans?

Hon. Mr. White: The limitations on the loans not requiring cabinet approval will be $100,000 initially.

Mr. Lewis: Right, and what about—

Hon. Mr. White: And as the new board and the newly structured organization gain experience, one anticipates that this limit will be increased by legislation to something more than $100,000, yet to be determined.

Mr. Lewis: What about those approved by cabinet?

Hon. Mr. White: At the present time, as a matter of policy, it is $500,000 in most parts of this province and $1 million in certain northern and eastern parts.

Mr. Lewis: Will the regulations change that?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I don't think that's by regulation now. I think that's by policy.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, so what will your regulations change?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, we are not contemplating a change in those limits at the present time. If this policy changes, the government will announce such a change.

Mr. Lewis: We will certainly go into the committee on this. It's a most extraordinary piece of legislation. It's meaningless.

Hon. Mr. White: The final section in this bill, Mr. Speaker, provides an additional assurance for the Legislature and for the public. Because while previous legislation did require an annual report to be filed, now for the first time every transaction, the amount and its details, are to be listed for the immediate and convenient information of the legislators.

So in using the words, "annual report," as a couple of critics have done, this is somewhat misleading. The annual report provided for before, continues. In addition to that annual report, there will be an all-inclusive list showing every transaction and the details of those transactions with various borrowers from the board.

Mr. Lewis: When?

Hon. Mr. White: As shown in the bill, immediately after the beginning of each session.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, very nice indeed! We can get the information now the moment the vote is given.

Mr. Renwick: And then it will be historic.

Mr. Lewis: But now you are saying six months or more can elapse.

Hon. Mr. White: I would like to deal for a minute or two with the remarks that were made concerning the effectiveness of performance loans.

Mr. Lewis: We won't know who is given a loan for six or eight months.

Hon. Mr. White: I have thought for some time that the productivity of these performance loans was unprovable.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Unlike your predecessor.

Hon. Mr. White: And I was interested therefore to see the article yesterday which has excited the leader of the New Democratic Party and who has chosen not to report certain—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): No, it is the minister's statement today.

Hon. Mr. White: —of this young man's—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. White: He has chosen not to report certain other parts of this young man's thesis.

Mr. MacDonald: Don't be patronizing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: The PhD student's study also indicates—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. White: I will listen to it. I will listen to it.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, you are talking about the young Harvard man's thesis, aren't you?

Hon. Mr. White: Sure.

Mr. Lewis: You wouldn't call me a young man?

Hon. Mr. White: Oh no!

Mr. Lewis: No, I didn't think so.

Hon. Mr. White: The young Harvard PhD student—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: His study also indicated grants to large companies do influence the establishment of plants that would otherwise be less than marginally economic, but the adopted grants do not concern those companies' chief lines of activities.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. White: Grants to large companies do attract foreign investments to Canada by raising the rate of return.

Mr. Lewis: Of course, yes.

Hon. Mr. White: Some small companies, with less than $20 million annual sales, will also occasion assistance for starting a new company but not for expansion of existing companies. The installed size of a project can be increased with the incentive of a grant to a small company. Many of his findings substantiate the assertions of my predecessors—

Mr. Lewis: Oh?

Hon. Mr. White: —and certainly gave rise not only to the legislation to be found here—

Mr. Lewis: A point of personal privilege. Point of order! Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The article says explicitly that in 11 of the 18 cases the grants from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion have not achieved an effect on location—

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Mr. Lewis: The point of order is that the precise terms relevant to what we are now discussing are set out in this news story which the minister is managing to avoid. It says explicitly that it had not achieved an effect on location, size, time—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order! Order! There can be no point of order on the minister's reply. He is reading from a newspaper clipping. He's reading what reportedly is said in the clipping and there is no point of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: He has distorted the truth.

Mr. Lewis: He is being notoriously selective.

Mr. Singer: Despicable.

Hon. Mr. White: I thought the hon. member, at question period today and after 8 o'clock this evening, had pretty well covered the major contention of the PhD student.

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Hon. Mr. White: I was trying to put the matter in balance by reading half a dozen of his further observations—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: —which show that there is some marginal effect.

Mr. Speaker: I think if all hon. members would refer to the principle of the bill we would get further—all hon. members!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the minister admit the programme didn't work out?

Hon. Mr. White: While I myself am wondering about the wisdom of continuing performance loans—

Mr. Lewis: Believe me, it is worth wondering about.

Hon. Mr. White: —it is an absolute economic fact that a marginal company will be induced into a new location or a different form of behaviour by the—

Mr. Lewis: Marginal companies?

Hon. Mr. White: —decrease in certain costs—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. White: —or the increase in certain profits.

Mr. Renwick: The only industry that is important is the gold mining—

Hon. Mr. White: So, Mr. Speaker, we find—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! This debate is completely out of order.

Hon. Mr. White: —that the federal government have introduced plans of this nature—

Mr. Lewis: Which department? Black and Decker?

Hon. Mr. White: —and they've helped out 10 or 20 or so—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: —we see that socialist governments in other provinces have give-away programmes under a variety of names. We see, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Martel: We call it kickback, you call it—

Hon. Mr. White: —that new legislation introduced a week ago, or somewhat more than a week ago, in the British House of Commons provides for a—

Mr. Singer: The minister is going to win anyway. Why doesn't he sit down?

Hon. Mr. White: —variety of tax relief for locating in certain areas and, in certain areas, provides for gifts of cash not only to start new enterprises but to replace equipment and refurbish and renew existing plant and equipment.

Mr. Lewis: Another Tory government.

Hon. Mr. White: In a conversation which I had with the Hon. Anthony Grant who is Minister of Industry—

Mr. Lewis: In a Tory government.

An hon. member: Getting Britain back on its feet again!

Hon. Mr. White: —he explained to me that the changes made were simply to broaden measures introduced by the predecessor Labour government. Let us recognize, while coming to grips with this very complicated matter, that parties of every description, in a wide variety of jurisdictions, are providing sums of money—

Mr. Lewis: They are taking equity.

Hon. Mr. White: —to new and old enterprises if they locate in certain places—

Mr. Lewis: They are taking equity.

Hon. Mr. White: —if they promise to increase employment in a certain fashion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: We here in Ontario, with a history of leading the way—

Mr. Lewis: I sat and listened to Stanley Randall for years. We all did.

Hon. Mr. White: —with a history of breaking through, are now wondering if we can't use the rather modest resources, I speak relatively of course, available to us from the Legislature in more effective ways

by lending all of these sums of money or perhaps by guaranteeing conventional loans, or perhaps by insuring loans in some way not yet attempted.

Mr. Renwick: This is not an argument for us to vote for the bill.

Mr. Lewis: The minister should not ask us to support the bill which he has rejected himself.

Hon. Mr. White: As an interim measure until a new—

Mr. Lewis: An interim measure? It has been five years.

Hon. Mr. White: —board of directors is appointed and until they accept the responsibility of scrutinizing and reviewing the existing policies and programmes or, rather, recommending changes to the government—

Mr. Lewis: Take the limits off them?

Hon. Mr. White: —with the concurrence of my cabinet colleagues, I instructed the Ontario Development Corp. yesterday to make no further performance loans to other than Canadian-controlled companies.

Mr. Lewis: Keep them a secret?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: When was that decided—yesterday? A quick decision over the supper hour?

Hon. Mr. White: It was decided in cabinet yesterday.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Can we please return to the principle of Bill 115?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The principle, please?

Hon. Mr. White: I think I have covered several matters, Mr. Speaker. Insofar as the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: —word of this particular section is concerned—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: —we can deal with that particular matter in committee.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 115. Shall the motion carry?

The House divided on the motion, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Allan	Braithwaite
Apps	Bullbrook
Beckett	Burr
Bennett	Dukszta
Birch (Mrs.)	Edighoffer
Brunelle	Foulds
Clement	Gaunt
Dymond	Germa
Eaton	Good
Evans	Laughren
Ewen	Lawlor
Gilbertson	Lewis
Grossman	MacDonald
Handleman	Martel
Havrot	Newman
Hodgson	(Windsor-Walkerville)
(Victoria-Haliburton)	Nixon
Kennedy	(Brant)
Kerr	Renwick
Lane	Roy
Leluk	Ruston
MacNaughton	Singer
Maeck	Smith
McIlveen	(Nipissing)
Meen	Spence—22.
Miller	
Newman	
(Ontario South)	
Nixon	
(Dovercourt)	
Potter	
Reilly	
Rhodes	
Root	
Rowe	
Scrivener (Mrs.)	
Smith	
(Simcoe East)	
Stewart	
Walker	
Wells	
White	
Winkler	
Yakabuski—40.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 40, the "nays" 22.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion for second reading now carried.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Lewis: At the minister's request, we will go into committee.

Mr. Speaker: The bill will go to committee of the whole House.

Agreed.

NORTHERN ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Hon. Mr. White moves second reading of Bill 116, An Act to amend the Northern Ontario Development Corp. Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Clerk of the House: The fifth order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, here we are!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Singer: Are we going to do the Insurance Act now?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. E. A. Winkler: (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Yes.

INSURANCE ACT

House in committee on Bill 96, An Act to amend the Insurance Act.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I would like to put a statement on the record before we deal section 18, where we adjourned, to say that the effective date provisions contained in section 27 of Bill 81—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —were admittedly confusing and complex as a result of an attempt to—

Mr. Singer: Confusing and complex? That's good!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —be uniform in placing all references to dates at the end of the bill, rather than where they originally were in the operative sections. A review of section 27 today indicates that if, in the last line, the words, "on January 1, 1972," had been included, there would be no doubt whatsoever as to the interpretation.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on! You can't believe that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But even as it stands the opinion has been that the logical interpretation of the effective date must be January 1, 1972—

Mr. Singer: Oh, shame!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —otherwise why would this date be even mentioned in this section?

Mr. Singer: Yes, otherwise why would it?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There was a clear statement, which is in the record in Hansard and also a press release by the Hon. A. A. Wishart who introduced the legislation, that the effective date was January 1, 1972. No question was raised—

Mr. Singer: Sellout! Shame!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No question was raised in the House or at any time during 1971 that these benefits would apply to motor vehicle accidents prior to January 1, 1972. Neither have the industry, the government, nor lawyers considered this to be the case. The industry, the government and the news media continue to publish and announce these benefits as effective from January 1, 1972.

Mr. Singer: You're embarrassing your lawyers over there. They are all—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The question of another interpretation was first raised by one lawyer early in 1972 after expiration of the period in question. While it was apparent that the double meaning could exist, it seems clear—

Mr. Singer: Oh yes!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —that the intent of all parties was that January 1, 1972, was the effective date.

Now I might say to the House that despite the statement I will move two amendments when we get on to section 19, as I indicated the last evening we were on this

bill, to make that very clear and so that it may be contained in the Act.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 18 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Singer: No Mr. Chairman, I don't think it should.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): The member for Downsview spits out bird seed.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the specious and ridiculous statement by the minister about what was apparently intended by very clear use of the English language in chapter 84 of the statutes of Ontario, 1971, just can't hold water. Recognizing that the minister is not trained in the law, but should have been expected to have at least average intelligence, one would have anticipated that he could have read, as everyone else did, what was contained in the statute as originally passed.

If the minister has before him the statute which he now purports to amend, I would ask him to look at it with me and explain to me, or to the House, or to the press, or to any reasonable member of the public in the Province of Ontario, what could be meant by the words as contained in section 27 of the statute he now purports to amend other than what it clearly says.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is an unfair question.

Mr. Singer: Well I'm sorry. I think the hon. minister is absolutely right. It is thoroughly unfair that one should expect that a statute would mean what it says. Let me read what the statute says. Let me read what section 27 says.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): Please read that!

Mr. Singer: Section 27 says, and I have it here in front of me:

> Sections 14 and 15 apply to all contracts evidenced by motor vehicle liability policies made or renewed on and after January 1, 1972.

Now that's abundantly clear. What other meaning could that phrase by itself have than that the new sections 14 and 15 apply to everything after the first of January? And then there is a comma, and that comma Mr. Chairman, is very important.

At that point, having made a clear and abundant statement of government policy, the government then goes on to state—after the comma:—"and all contracts evidenced by motor vehicle liabilities," comma again, "(a) made or renewed before and subsisting when this Act receives royal assent."

Now what does that mean?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): It is clear enough.

Mr. Singer: The date of royal assent was July 28, 1971. If the clause meant what the minister has now speciously, foolishly, arbitrarily, wrongly stated he thinks it meant, why have you got that subsection a) in? What can it possibly mean? It must mean what it says. Surely it must mean what it says. It must mean "and all contracts evidenced by motor vehicle liability policies made or renewed before," —before means July 28, 1971" and subsisting when this Act receives royal assent." What other possible interpretation of the English language can the minister bring to this?

Well, maybe there's a covering clause and the word "or" is in! "Or (b) made or renewed after this Act receives royal assent and before January 1, 1972."

Why did you have a (b) part in that unless you meant that you were going to make it retroactive and to be effective on July 28, 1971?

How can there possibly be what the minister says is a 'misunderstanding"? How can there possibly be what the minister says, or what the definitive note is, in the statute opposite page 6, section 18:

> The amendment confirms the original intention that mandatory automobile benefits enacted in 1971 take effect for all contracts on and after January 1, 1972.

In fact, what the government is now saying is that for purposes of clarifying something that was abundantly clear, insofar as I can understand the English language, something that was abundantly clear when it was passed by this House and confirmed by royal assent on July 28, 1971, now is no longer abundantly clear.

And now for the purposes of some so-called clarification, we have this peculiar and unusual amendment.

In other words, if the minister said: "We're sorry; we made a mistake. What the legislation said, we didn't really mean to do. We have now been shown the error of our

ways by the insurance companies. We now recognize that the insurance companies feel that they've been badly done by, and they have been denied additional premiums which they felt they should have gotten. We now have made peace with them. Perhaps because in the meantime we went to an election—and perhaps because before the election we received substantial support from them; and now we have decided to change it." Then it would make some sense.

But Mr. Chairman, there is no way the minister can bring this amendment before us and say it was for sake of clarification, or by reason of misunderstanding. Because no matter how you read this section, this section 27 of the statute of 1971, there is no ability—and I defy anyone to get up in this House and say there is any ability—to interpret that statute as reading that it should be effective as of January 1.

You can say it, and you can write it in your statute, and the minister can make it in statements until he's blue in the face, but it just doesn't stand the test of the common sense of the English language. It just doesn't stand the test of public credulity.

So one says then: "Why is it done? What, in effect, is the answer to this? Why have you done this?"

Well what it means, in fact, Mr. Chairman, is that for a period from July 27 or 28, 1971, until January 1, the government is cutting off all of those people who might have had an ability or reason to claim under the compulsory no-fault provisions of the new introductions to the Insurance Act.

You will remember with me, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) stood in his place and said: "This government has finally recognized that we should have compulsory no-fault. We are finally going to adopt the logic put forward by the select committee on insurance."

The committee that reported in 1961 had four cabinet ministers on it. It was chaired by the then-Treasurer, the number two man in the government, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan). We recommended this sort of thing and it took 10 years of whittling away until finally we got to it; and we got to it on the eve of the election of 1971.

The Provincial Secretary for whatever his responsibilities are, who then held the portfolio that this minister holds, stood up in all his glory and said: "We have advanced and we are going to have compulsory no-fault and it's going to apply to everybody, and it's going to apply in the words of this statute of 1971, from the date on which the statute receives royal assent."

Then quietly and subtly, and perhaps not too quietly and not too subtly, the insurance lobby got to work on you fellows and said: "This is unfair to us. This is really unfair because we haven't been able to collect the additional premiums. We are going to be hurt if this comes into effect on July 27."

Somebody over there said to them—I don't know which one of you it was, whether it was this minister, his leader or whoever it was—but somebody said: "Don't worry about it. Let's get the election over. Let's have your support for whatever it is worth in dollars, in bodies or whatever it is, and we'll fix it up after the election is over. And we're going to say to the Legislature and to the people of Ontario: 'You didn't understand what we had written in clear words in the English language.' We're going to change it on that basis. And we're going to save you insurance companies from the expense of paying all of those people who could have had a claim from July 28 to Jan. 1. We're going to say. 'You didn't really understand what we were saying when the Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence introduced it, what we said on the election platform and we are going to cut all you people out.' "

Therefore, anybody who might have had a claim under the compulsory no-fault from July 28 until Jan. 1 is cut out unless there was some other basis on which they could have had a claim. A whole group of people —I don't know what the statistics are: perhaps the minister knows. Perhaps he has the statistics with him. How many people have you cut out?

What in fact has happened was a hiatus period where the insurance companies weren't quite too sure of their ground. The insurance companies didn't answer their mail. The insurance companies pretended they didn't receive their mail.

In one case that I have in my office, despite the fact that I complied with the other provisions of the Act—we talked about those earlier, and I won't refer to them again—I sent, by registered mail, to the head office of the company, a notice of a claim under what appeared to be the logical and reasonable wording of this section asserting the claim. I didn't get an answer for 2½ months.

Fascinatingly, Mr. Chairman, the answer came forward only after this clarifying

amendment was tabled in the House. At that point, the insurance company concerned—and I'll name it; Travelers—said: "We are now taking the position that claims under compulsory no-fault are only valid after Jan. 1." Now why did they suddenly get that courage? They got that courage suddenly because they knew what was coming forward from government and that government was about to bail them out.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is despicable. I think that is playing fast and loose with the people of the Province of Ontario. The government decided to introduce—and at that point it had the unanimous support of all members of this House—compulsory no-fault, which was to be effective on July 28. The wording was abundantly clear. I defy this minister or any of his legal advisers to explain to me how this wording could be interpreted in any other way than that it applied to those policies in existence on July 28, 1971.

No number of words saying their intention might have been different or their wording might have been bad can derogate from the natural interpretation of the wording that is in this statute. I defy the minister to tell me how any other possible interpretation can be meant or, in fact, how this explanatory note makes any sense; or to call any one of his battery of legal advisers who sit over there to explain, in any sense of the use of the English language, how this possibly could have been.

Mr. Chairman, having exhausted that argument, one must come to the conclusion that the government once again has bowed to the powerful insurance lobby that says: "This is going to be too expensive for us. We supported you at election time. Now you owe us something." Now this government is going to bow to them on the feeble and paltry excuse "that people cannot reasonably interpret the natural English language usage we employed in the original statute." I say that is a phony, Mr. Chairman—a phony completely and absolutely.

Then we had the strange anomaly of the minister introducing amendments to section 19, which he alluded to very lightly in his remarks tonight and which, at one stage at least, he intimated—and I don't challenge the minister particularly on his ability to quickly make legal interpretations—but he certainly intimated to me, and I have tried to pin him down reasonably carefully, and to some extent he avoided it and kept several escape hatches open, but he intended to imply, at least, as I left—and I wasn't prepared to buy it until I had a reasonable chance to examine the wording of 19—that the amendments to 19 were going to take care of the objections that I had made.

Well, in fact, Mr. Chairman, they don't take care of those things at all. In fact, what they do is to bolster the position of the insurance companies. I would hold suspect, Mr. Chairman, as the source of the original drafting, or the original suggestion, for the amendments to 19. It would take a very, very experienced insurance lawyer to recognize this technical point that might be argued in court, that there was a hiatus period, even though you amended section 18, that might perhaps be interpreted by the courts as giving someone a leg up to interpret section 18 the way it was originally written.

To reduce that to very simple language, what I am suggesting is that having run into trouble on section 18, somebody—and I don't know who it was—somebody who works, not for the government, but for insurance companies, said, "Oho, there is another possible loophole." Somebody said—whispered in government ears—"Let's amend 19 to eliminate even that possibility."

Well I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government and the minister have been substantially less than frank with us in connection with these amendments to 18 and to 19.

We will deal with 19 when we come to it. But certainly the statement of government policy, both in the words of the minister of the day, in announcements that they used publicly—in announcements that they used to indicate what great fellows they were during the course of the political campaign—indicated clearly that compulsory no-fault was to commence on July 28.

You have now cut out, or you are about to cut out, by the introduction of this amendment under the false guise—and I say that deliberately and definitely, under the false guise of clarification—you are now cutting out all of those people who would have been entitled to compensation if they were involved in an accident from July 28 to Dec. 31. I say you have misled the people of Ontario. You have hurt those people who are entitled to complain. You are subsidizing the insurance companies who have your ear, who supported you, and this is now the payoff.

I say, Mr. Chairman, insofar as we, in opposition—or at least my colleagues and I—are able to express our opposition to it, we will not go along with it.

I say this is as venal an act, as blatant an act to favour an established group in the community that I have ever, in fact, seen in this House, and that when someone responsible for introducing legislation can write in explanatory words that this amendment confirms the original intention of what section 27 was supposed to say—and when you read section 27, you just can't justify that at all—then I say the government has been double dealing the public of Ontario; that you are two-faced; that you are, indeed, and that you now are retreating in answer to the support that you got from those insurance companies.

I come back to the case in my own office. The fact that the particular insurance company that I was dealing with, paused 2½ months before it would even answer my claim under the Act, as it was worded, is indicative enough of the approach of the insurance industry generally.

Why have those insurance companies paused? Number one, it is going to cost them money; number two, if they have to pay, they are going to have to pay at the rate of $70 a week for people who have lost their jobs, instead of $35 a week, and there is an awful lot of money that is available to insurance companies, and available for political contributions if they can make that saving in face of the very positive statements of the statute, the very positive statements of the hon. Provincial Secretary for Resources Development and the very positive statements of government people and Conservative candidates who said, "We now have in this advanced province compulsory no-fault that we are taking into this election, and it is effective from July 28."

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say this: There is just no way that we in the Liberal Party can accept this amendment that the minister proposes. I propose an amendment to this effect, that section 18 be amended by deleting from the third line and from the fifth and sixth lines of section 27(1) the words "Jan. 1, 1972," and substituting the words "July 28, 1971," in each instance. I think that makes abundant good sense.

I think if the minister is fair—and on occasion he is a fair man; he played ducks and drakes with me about bringing on this debate tonight and he well knows it—he will accept the previous commitment of government in this House and to the people of Ontario and he will do what was originally intended. The government has more votes, but he will not force this amendment on the people of Ontario and thereby deprive that group of persons who are entitled to benefit by announced public policy—which was enacted in the statutes and assented to on July 28—of the fair treatment which they are entitled to, merely at the behest of those insurance companies which have for some peculiar reason been able to bring pressure to bear on the government.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Singer moves:

That section 18 be amended by deleting from the third line and from the fifth and sixth lines of section 27, subsection (1) of the Insurance Amendment Act, 1971, the words 1st day of January, 1972, and substituting the words 28th day of July, 1971 in each instance.

Those in favour of Mr. Singer's—any discussion?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, before we bring the full weight of our party down in support of the amendment—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The what?

Mr. Renwick: —we would like to give the minister the opportunity to—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): All five of them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am glad he didn't say overwhelming weight.

Mr. Renwick: —stand the bill down. He stood the bill down on a number of other occasions. Why doesn't he stand it down now and reconsider the weight of the remarks of the member for Downsview?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have, Mr. Chairman, considered the full weight of the arguments. I have no intention of standing down or withdrawing the bill and will deal with it this evening or at any other time you want to deal with it but it is going straight on. I'll deal with the hon. member for Downsview, I think, when I hear the rest of the argument. I'm prepared to hear it now.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mr. Renwick: We are not going to stand here and simply repeat an argument which has been put forward quite powerfully and has been adequately stated. All we are going to say is that it is quite obvious on the face of the bill as it presently stands—that is, the Act which was passed a year ago—that that was the correct position. That was the

position the Tory government took heading into an election.

We do not think it is possible for the government at this point to come in with an amendment which changes a substantial part of the basis on which it derived the support of the members of the Legislature a year ago. It is as simple as that, and the amendment which is proposed by the member for Downsview is one which we will support. There is absolutely no reason why it shouldn't be supported. I would think that the minister knows very well that his stature in the House will grow and expand—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Don't let him con you!

Mr. Renwick: —if he would admit that he has been unwisely advised.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If it expands any more—

Mr. Renwick: Or if he would disclose to us who put the idea before him in the first place. It certainly didn't come from within the confines of his own department. That's for certain! We would like to know who it is who is constantly able to get at every Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs or Consumer and Commercial Relations in the Province of Ontario about insurance matters.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Terrible!

Mr. Renwick: It goes on all the time.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Renwick: Every piece of legislation which comes in dealing with insurance matters bears the imprint of someone outside the government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Against the rules of the House.

Mr. Singer: I said it too. You can pick us up.

Mr. Renwick: That's not true of others. All we are suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that we have given him the opportunity to withdraw. He doesn't appear to want to take it—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No!

Mr. Renwick: —so we will support the amendment proposed by the member for Downsview.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, before the minister speaks, surely this is one of the rare occasions when an administration has tried to cover up an obvious gaffe with an amendment and which hasn't got the honesty, at least, to put forward the mistake and say it is trying to correct it by the power of the Legislature. The argument has been put strongly for the amendment that has been placed before us by the member for Downsview; but one of the serious shortcomings is that this minister is not prepared to say a mistake had been made. It wasn't even his responsibility; it was his predecessor's, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, or something, who is, of course, not here tonight.

I am no particular fan of either of the ministers, but it seems to be unfair that the new minister has to stand the responsibility for this sort of thing, because if he is prepared to use the weight of the Conservative majority to ride over, not the argument so much, but the specific factual information that has been put before us, then it is certainly not going to redound to his honour.

There are many things that he can do. The easiest, I would say, is simply to accept the amendment and face the music. I don't know how many cases are pending. I don't suppose there is a tremendously large number of cases of people who have appealed to the courts for payments under the provisions of the statute as we passed it a year ago, which meant that no-fault insurance provisions were in force as of July 28, according to their understanding and the understanding of any reasonable person who reads the statute which we passed last year.

One of the most appalling aspects of this is that the minister is trying to maintain the veracity of this marginal note which simply says the amendment confirms the original intention that the mandatory automobile benefits enacted in 1971 take effect for all contracts on and after Jan. 1, 1972. It might have been the intention in the mind of the minister or his legal advisers, the people who drafted that amendment, but I can hardly credit that that is a fact, because it says specifically that it is going to take effect upon royal assent, which is July 28.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply advise the minister that he has a couple of alternatives, and I think he is probably getting a little sensitive about this. I don't think he wants to withdraw the bill again for further consideration, although that is one course of

action which must recommend itself. The most obvious one is to realize that he cannot, with the approach and the rationalization that he has given the House so far, change this statute to correct a mistake which is his responsibility.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is a very serious matter indeed if the minister intends to proceed, as he expressed his intention rather heatedly a moment ago. In other words, you had enough of this fooling around and you are simply going to ride roughshod over these reasonable arguments, and they are reasonable. I don't appeal to the minister; I simply warn him that his honour as a minister is at stake in this particular matter and he should support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day, the minister beamed upon us, smiled seraphically, was amenable to any type of blandishment that might proceed from this side. As the hours grow long, I guess the attrition of office makes the man bullish, no matter how reasonable then we become as the day goes on. He has foreclosed, his mind closes down, bankruptcy takes over. The purblindness of this particular thing. It goes beyond ignorance. It's no error.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Good old Pat. He is so kind.

Mr. Lawlor: This is a deliberate piece of chicanery, if ever there was one. You have your choice; you are sitting there with your option tonight. Either you betray the electorate, prejudice the cases before the court, having led them into a trap, for which they probably have to pay the costs, etc., or you betray the insurance companies. Now which do you wish to betray?

Mr. Renwick: We dare you to go to the country on this issue.

Mr. Singer: Tomorrow.

Mr. Lawlor: I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should all gather up our tents and retire downstairs to the committee on Colleges and Universities where we may undertake a little exercise in literacy. Could anything be clearer? Not only is it clear in the first instance under the section, as set forth in section 27, 1971: "any policies made or renewed before and subsisting when the Act received royal assent." One might say there is ambiguity there, that if one were ill-disposed toward the commonwealth you could read some kind of nebulous misapplication into the whole thing. But you go ahead to confirm, condone and make it abundantly clear beyond any peradventure what you mean. You go on with the next section: "made or renewed after this Act receives royal assent and before the 1st day of January, 1971." Then you have the blatant effrontery to come before this Legislature and say that somehow or other you miscalculated it; it was an error in judgement; it was a mistake in the—

Mr. Renwick: What about the July part?

Mr. Lawlor: The July part comes under the first subsection on the royal assent.

One thing that bemuses me about the House, and it occurs radically often, is the superficiality of the reasons given for legislation. Very seldom in matters of this kind, where political bribery is involved, does the true intent, the real meaning and purpose of legislation emerge. You use every foil, every particular form of pernicious argument, specious reasoning, misapplied facts, any damned thing you can get your hands on except telling the truth! Except coming to the point!

The real reason is, as has been stated, that you are in their pockets. Did they make a deal with you? Did they say, "Now, listen, we'll let go of the really vicious provisions of the gratuitous passenger in return for the fact that you will wipe out five to six months of insurance claims against us. We think we can trade off on this particular basis."

Sometimes, I think on the basis of this, it is almost worth it to get rid of the gratuitous passenger provisions, but not quite—not at the cost in terms of blatant pharisaism on your part. How can you sit there and smile in face of what the record says?

To bring the weight of your whole caucus down upon this thing is traducing the whole democratic principle. It is sticking out your tongue and saying, "We are the power in the land. We'll pass whatever legislation we please. We don't care how much a subversion of intent it is. We don't care what are the betrayals involved in the thing. We don't care if you know it is a gift to the insurance companies and to the interests that help to pay for our rather massive campaign. We can't reverse ourselves at this stage, much as my conscience would move me to do so because we may not receive the same funding in the future having put the load where it belongs, on the insurance interests."

Everybody read this section that way. Numerous actions have been started. I know of any number of cases based on this before the courts; every one of them is now in severe jeopardy.

You can do this perhaps once or twice in a session. Hold onto your hats—you may get away with this one—but this kind of malpractice on your part will catch up. It is an unconscionable betrayal.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest—

Mr. Lawlor: In total obstinacy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not total obstinacy. It it a strange thing, Mr. Chairman—as long as you are doing what the fellows on the other side want you to do, you are a great guy; you are expansive; you are a good legislator; you are a great fellow. But once in a while when the chips are down and you say, "I am going to stand on this particular point" you are no good; you are stupid; you are useless; you are no credit to the Legislature.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I want to stand here tonight and tell the members of the opposition, particularly the member for Downsview and the member for Lakeshore, that if they think for one moment, at this particular point in time, that I have been, in any way, manner or means brought to the passage of this amendment by the insurance companies, they had better have another look at their own positions!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You said it and I am going to put the record clear. First of all, the hon. member for Downsview didn't even know that it was the Hon. Arthur Wishart who brought the legislation in, not the management resource secretary! The Hon. Arthur Wishart brought this in. That is quite correct!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is even worse.

Mr. Singer: That is worse.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: So it is a matter of interpretation, and you say it so clearly—

Mr. Singer: How does the minister interpret it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: First of all, I want to tell you that I tried to find out if there were any statistics I could place before the House tonight and apparently they are not available to me.

Mr. Singer: Tell us how you read the common English words any other way.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What is the member's question?

Mr. Singer: How do you read the common English words any other way?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am going to go back a little further than that because I read a statement here tonight and he called it specious and ignorant and everything else.

Mr. Singer: It certainly is.

Mr. Winkler: Well, all right now; if that's the particular case, I wonder how far does the member for Downsview go back and look up the record to know exactly how clear it was at the time the legislation was in the house?

The hon. member for Downsview tonight placed a lot of emphasis on the words that I brought into the House the other night. I must admit I'll have to backtrack on the private conversation that I had with him; but he wasn't that magnanimous tonight. I was out to an engagement too, and I made it back. I want him to know that. But let's go back, for the sake of everybody who has spoken tonight. And I want to tell you, if I could I'd bring in every member of this party tonight to vote against your amendment. And I'll tell you why—

Mr. Singer: You sure should—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If you'd do a little homework, any one of you; if you'd go to work and do a little homework, and find out what qualification is—If you're going to hang your hat on every word that's spoken for Hansard, why didn't you go back to June 24, 1971, and quote the Hon. Arthur Wishart, on that particular day when he introduced the legislation? I shall read his words to you: This is in answer to a question by the member for Riverdale. The Hon. Mr. Wishart:

> This bill requires that beginning on Jan. 1. 1972, all motor vehicle liability insurance contracts must include the no-fault programme.

Now there you are. And I'll ask everybody in the House to vote against that amendment despite the implications of any of your words about who I'm supposed to be with.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, why did Mr. Wishart put it in the bill?

Mr. Singer: Why did you write it that way?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If I say to you tonight in the light of that particular statement that I am doing this for clarification as of the time it was brought before the whole province, which was sometime in January, let me say; nobody recognized this until January.

Mr. Singer: There is nothing to recognize. You read it the way it was written.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You might curse and damn the insurance companies; maybe so, I don't know how right or wrong you are. It's not for me to say. You placed your own interpretation on how they function. But I'm going to tell you that there were a lot of payments made out from the date of royal assent—

Mr. Singer: Then why did they pay it if they didn't read it the way it reads?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —until Jan. 1; and they will be legitimized so that no insured will suffer as a result. But the clarification that I suggest to you tonight is in the light of the minister's words of that day. And I'll stand by them; and you know it as well as I do.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, what the minister says, is again specious nonsense.

Surely the minister who sat for a while in the federal Parliament, who I understand was the whip for a certain party up there, must have been around legislatures long enough to recognize that when a statute is passed by a legislative body, it's supposed to mean what it says it does; and notwithstanding any single phrase—and even that phrase is taken out of context—that he might find in a Hansard debate.

There is nothing in what Mr. Wishart says that doesn't imply, as you and your colleagues said on the hustings, that we now have compulsory no-fault, and it commences as of the date of royal assent.

Now let me review again, with the minister, what this Act says in the simple English language—and it's not that complicated—and the minister need not retreat between his lack of legal training and what he thinks somebody might have intended; or one single phrase that he extracts out of Hansard. Let me read it to him: Section 27 of chapter 84 of the statutes of 1971 says this—sections 14 and 15 apply, and these are the compulsory no-fault: "To all contracts—"

Mr. Chairman: Order please! This is completely repetitious—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, surely I am entitled and I am going to insist upon my right to answer the minister, who says that he, by quoting one phrase out of Hansard, has refuted all my argument.

And I am going to repeat it because I don't think the minister understands; and I think it sufficiently important that we read this language to the minister and ask him to explain it.

Mr. Chairman: Well, if you can shorten it. Order please! You're simply repeating what you said—

Mr. Singer: Well I am entitled to repeat it. We are in committee, Mr. Chairman, and I am entitled to argue as many times as I want in committee about a paticular point that I'm putting forward. Now I'm going to continue. "Sections 14 and 15 apply to all contracts evidenced by motor vehicle liability policy—"

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The hon. member knows he is—

Mr. Singer: "—made or reviewed on or before the 1st—"

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member knows he's repeating exactly—

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to repeat, surely; because the minister has attempted to refute my arguments and I am stressing by repetition the fact that he has not refuted them.

Mr. Chairman: Could you paraphrase them?

Mr. Singer: All right, I'm clarifying it—

Mr. Chairman: No, paraphrase it.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister has misunderstood what I said before and by way of clarification let me again attempt to interpret what was in the statute, chapter 84 of 1971. If there is another English interpretation, I wish the minister would guide me in it. Or perhaps his legal advisers could tell him how it can be done? Can the minister tell me how this wording can mean anything other than the way I interpret it? Could the minister advise me how these words mean anything other than the interpretation I am going to attribute to them?

Sections 14 and 15 apply to all contracts evidenced by motor vehicle liability poli-

cies made or renewed on or before Jan. 1, 1972—

the minister and I are perhaps in agreement on that part. Then comes the comma:

—and all contracts evidenced by motor vehicle liabilities policies (a) made or renewed before or subsisting when this Act receives royal assent.

Will the minister please explain to me, because perhaps I am particularly dense, why that doesn't mean what it says it means? Can the minister possibly tell me why those words are there and in that context? What can they possibly mean if they don't mean that they apply to everything after the date of royal assent, which is July 28, 1971? Perhaps I missed something in the context of the minister's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am not being repetitious at all, I am merely asking the minister to clarify his refutation of my previous statement. Even if you go on to subsection (b), which reads, "or made or renewed after this Act receives royal assent and made before Jan. 1, 1972." Note the words, "before Jan. 1, 1972."

Mr. Chairman, I may be dense. I have thought for a number of years that I am reasonably conversant with the normal usage of the English language, both in here and in our courts, and in other forums where from time to time I have the occasion to venture forth certain opinions.

This is the way I read it. It may be that all my education and all my training has gone amiss and my reading of this is completely unreasonable and illogical. If it is, I wish the minister would explain it to me.

I hate to embarrass the hon. member for Niagara Falls—

Mr. J. T. Clement (Niagara Falls): I am not embarrassed.

Mr. Singer: He says he is not embarrassed. But I have had great faith, in talking to him from time to time, and we did have occasion to talk in the lobby over there a little while ago, earlier this afternoon. I said to him—and he is a fine member; he has legal training and so on—

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Very affable.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He's got a QC after his name.

Mr. Singer: I said to him, "How would you interpret section 27? You are a man learned in the law. You're a man who has had a good education. You make your living out of this kind of thinking and this kind of interpretation. Can you interpret these words in any other way than the way I suggest?"

Mr. Givens: What did he say?

Mr. Singer: And without quoting, or I hope without misquoting the hon. member for Niagara Falls he said, "I agree with you completely." He came back to me later and said—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is going to vote for it.

Mr. Singer: Yes, he came back to me later and said, "I have taken occasion to consult with a couple of people, and one of the people I consulted with was an insurance agent who said, 'I take the interpretation that the insurance company is correct because I have had a directive to do it.'" And the other person he talked to said, "Well, I agree substantially with the position put forward by the member for Downsview and the sort of quick, off-hand interpretation from the member for Niagara Falls."

If I have misquoted or put words in the mouth of the member for Niagara Falls incorrectly, I hope he'll correct me.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the minister to tell us how these words in the section can be interpreted in any other way than that in which they are written?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, I will be creating the same offence as the member for Downsview, Mr. Chairman. I simply want to tell him he knows the exercise. He is not, as he is endeavouring to let on, obtuse about the entire matter at all. What I have done is in conjunction with the statement by my predecessor on first reading; surely that must have been clear as an explanation of the intent of the bill. It could have no other meaning. And I have the amendments before the House for the particular purpose of clarifying the situation, protecting the insured in cases where the cases were accepted and establishing further for him and others in his particular field the effective date as Jan. 1, 1972. And I can say no more.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Singer's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): You're just not even for real, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. We'll have a vote. There will be a vote. Since there is one more section, would it be agreeable to stack this vote with any possible vote that there might be on section 19?

Mr. Martel: We'll have it right now!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think we should have the vote on this section, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

The committee divided on Mr. Singer's amendment, which was defeated on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 23, the "nays" 41.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and section 18 shall stand as part of the bill.

Section 18 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: On section 19 the hon. minister has an amendment.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: On section 19, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated the other evening I move that subsection 1 of section 19 of the bill be amended by deleting "and 12" and substituting therefor "12 and 18."

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. minister care to move the other part of that amendment?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I will move another amendment to section 19.

I move that subsection 19 be amended by adding thereto the following subsection 3:

"Section 18 shall be deemed to come into force on the 28th day of July, 1971."

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Winkler moves that in section 19, subsection 1 of the bill be amended by deleting the words "and 12" in the first line, and substituting therefor the words "12 and 18," and that the said section 19 be further amended by adding thereto the following subsection 3:

"(3) Section 18 shall be deemed to come into force on the 28th day of July, 1971."

Shall the motion carry?

The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, section 19 further compounds the chicanery that the minister is imposing upon the people of the Province of Ontario, not only by his refusal to accept the common English wording and the common English understanding of the previous section in the previous Act, but now he goes even further.

He brings forward to us an amendment that must have been dreamed up—and I say this advisedly and deliberately and purposefully—must have been dreamed up in the offices of the insurance lawyers of the insurance companies.

It is far too astute and far too clever to have ever emanated from the civil servants, with due respect to my good friends who sit under the gallery over there. The essence of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to plug up a gap that only very remotely could possibly have been argued, perhaps before the Supreme Court of Canada, because there might have been a hiatus period which might have caused the judiciary on its highest level to wonder what really was the intention of this Legislature when it passed its original Act.

When he introduced this amendment several nights ago, the minister was good enough to send me a copy of it, and the explanatory note is particularly elucidating. It says, "This amendment further amplifies that the substituted section 27 is to apply to rights acquired before Jan. 1, 1972, subject to section 27(2)."

Well, the only further amplification that I can understand out of this amendment—and I was not quick to adopt it when the minister suggested that he went along with my objections that I raised the night when it was introduced and that he was agreeing substantially with me. I am glad we had occasion to pause so that we could examine it and try to analyse whether, in fact, the minister meant what he implied or didn't really understand what he was implying.

I have now reread Hansard, reread the amendment, and I have come to the conclusion that the minister, with all the goodwill in the world—and I would be the last one to attribute bad motives to the minister—really didn't understand what he was talking about.

What is here is what was handed to the minister by way of his civil servants and which I suggest, and again advisedly, came to his civil servants out of the offices of the insurance industry. Some very clever lawyer who is looking for the last remote possibility of saddling insurance companies with the additional onus of having to look after an

extra five or six months' claims has come up with this.

An hon. member: Prove it!

Mr. Singer: Perhaps some lawyer for the claimant will have the courage and determination to pursue this kind of a claim as far as the Supreme Court of Canada. Because without the amendment to section 19 I don't think we would have any question about that five-month hiatus period, unless it had gone that far and unless we had a very wealthy litigant to pursue it that far.

It must have emanated from the deep dark recesses of insurance company offices. It is a final and ultimate excuse, a final and ultimate argument to bring in an amendment that is going to remove once and for all any doubt that the insurance companies are going to be favoured, notwithstanding the normal English language usage and interpretation of section 18.

That's what's here, and without any disrespect at all for the civil servants who advise the minister, I would be very surprised if it emanated from the thinking of the draughtsmen who wrote section 27, as it was originally written. It's just too clever by far to have come from the same source.

Mr. Chairman, I say this confirms my most base suspicion. This is the ultimate convincing argument that the government has sold out to the insurance companies. And for what? What have you sold out for? The insurance companies are off the hook for five months' claims under the no-fault. They don't have to pay $70 a week until Jan. 1; from July 28 to Jan. 1 they can get away with $35 a week. They can deny the claims of people like my clients, and how many hundreds or thousands of others, under the compulsory no-fault claim provision that the government so proudly took into the election campaign as one of its deeds of magnificent achievement.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is one of the basest hours that this government has faced. It's an obvious and complete sellout and there is no other way to explain it. I don't fault this minister because I don't think he knows what's going on. I don't even fault the civil servants because they were told by somebody—

Mr. Renwick: Whom do you fault?

Mr. Singer: —and I don't know who told them, but it came from the insurance industry. I fault the whole government because they bowed to this base suggestion and I see no basis on which these amendments to 19 should be accepted.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister a question. If the public bought policies from insurance companies, both the public and the insurance companies being under the perfectly legitimate impression that the no-fault provisions would cover from July 28 to Dec. 31, 1971, what happens to the money which was paid by the public during that period of time?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Are you referring to premiums?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, premiums.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As far as I am concerned, and I can't quote chapter or verse, I would like the hon. member to tell me how many companies did, in fact, increase their premiums in that period of time, from the end of June until Jan. 1?

Mr. Lewis: Right. On six-month policies, for example, which lapsed in the period between June and December, 1971—I was chatting with a member of the government, not an elected member but a member of the service, in the members' dining room no more than five minutes ago. He told me that he and two colleagues were involved in three separate insurance companies—he named them; they are all major companies—to which additional premiums had been paid between June 30, 1971, and Dec. 31, 1971. I ask you, by way of interest, suppose Allstate increased it? Suppose Continental increased it. Suppose Zurich increased it? What would you do for the people who paid increased premiums during that six-month period? How do you answer that?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is another form of forgivable loan.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have no particular answer to give to the generalities mentioned by the hon. member—

Mr. Renwick: Generalities?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes. I can tell him that in the case that I know of, that I am personally acquainted with, the company did not increase their rates until after Jan. 1. I would have to inquire into that and find out before I would make a determination about

claims that might have been made—if the rates were increased as of a certain date and if the claims were made after that time—and they were refused.

Mr. Lewis: I want to ask, suppose the rates were increased? If I am able to identify for you, as I have no doubt in my mind will be done, increased premiums which were paid in that six-month period on the assumption on the part of both parties that the no-fault provision had taken effect, what happens to that premium money?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Everybody's policy went up.

Mr. Lewis: What happens to it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I guess it goes to the company.

Mr. Lewis: It goes to the company? All right, let's just look at what it means. It was, on the average, to be $9 a policy for roughly a million policies. We pointed out at the time that you were offering the insurance companies an additional $9 million on the introduction of no-fault which most of us argued at the time was a gratuitous thing, a gift, because they didn't need the additional money anyway. It would be covered quite comfortably.

You gave them a potential $9 million. Now you are saying that for a five-month period when, I suppose, up to $3 million to $4 million of that could have been received by the insurance companies, no benefits would have to be conferred and the money could simply be pocketed without any benefits at all being paid under the no-fault provision.

How can you possibly justify that? How can you say to the public of Ontario, "We have retroactively changed the situation under which you paid $3 million to $4 million to the insurance companies through increased premiums. Sorry, that's their money, they don't have to confer any benefits for that money. You just paid it and it is lost"? You can't do that by way of legislation. You are doing it tonight, I suspect. But how can you possibly justify it? I would like an answer.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, I can tell the hon. member that there are claims that have been honoured as of the end of June 1971, and there is no question about that. I don't wish to tell the hon. member that there is a relationship. I don't know. I am not aware in detail of what he is telling me about. I know that there are a substantial number of claims that have been paid—and are being paid today—to that period of time, if the company concerned accepted the claim under the new rates. I can verify this. I cannot verify the fact that companies did, in fact, increase their rates, but I shall certainly investigate that.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I would appreciate that really.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will.

Mr. Bullbrook: If I might continue on the extremely valid point the hon. member for Scarborough West makes, a completely valid point.

Surely to goodness, Mr. Minister, it is not inappropriate to ask that you and your departmental officials must have made this inquiry of themselves, if not of the industry itself. You must have said: "If we're going to render to you no liability, then what is going to happen to the additional premium?" You must have done that. If you haven't then—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Would you just repeat that?

Mr. Bullbrook: I am saying in effect that if we are going to remove liability, then your departmental officials must have asked themselves, "What about those insured who have paid additional premiums for that type of coverage?"

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, it is not for me to say here this evening that the increases that took place—if they did take place, in relationship to your inference, or to the inference of the member for Scarborough West—weren't normal increases. I am quite sure that the Superintendent of Insurance would not have approved increases in regard to the no-fault benefit until Jan. 1. It is a situation I will have to look at, and I can't answer that for him tonight.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I just don't understand. The minister comes here with this kind of a benefit for insurance companies. He comes without statistics. He comes without facts and figures. He says he is quite sure that the Superintendent of Insurance must have done such and such. Where is the Superintendent of Insurance? Where is the statement from the Superintendent of Insurance? In fact, the minister is saying that he hasn't the faintest idea.

Surely he can't expect the Legislature to pass holus-bolus, and without any information, this kind of an amendment and not be able to quote one statistic to us. It is going to let insurance companies off the hook, many

of whom have benefited from excess premiums based on the largess given to them by government before the last election.

As sceptical as I might be, and being very careful not to challenge the minister's integrity because I would be the last person to do that, I say that we just cannot buy the statement that the Superintendent of Insurance surely must have done so and so. I would be much more impressed if the minister had before him and was able to read to us tonight a full analytic statement prepared by the Superintendent of Insurance telling us just what those facts were. In the absence of that, Mr. Chairman, and even though the hour is approaching 10:30, I think we have got to keep on insisting that we get that kind of information before we allow this to go to a vote.

We need that information. My very strong suspicion is that a gratuitous many-thousand-dollar benefit is being given to the insurance companies for no other consideration that I can see than that they are friends of the government. If there is an answer to that charge, and if it can come from the Superintendent of Insurance, then let the minister stand in his place, armed with a statement from the Superintendent of Insurance setting out those facts.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. We have reached the hour of 10:30 when we must rise unless there is a motion.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I just ask if you will give me one moment. I would like to respond to that. I would like to say that the Superintendent of Insurance did not authorize the collection of payments for no-fault insurance until the very last few days of December. I don't care if you want a statement from him or from me. I am telling you that is the case. Therefore any increase of premiums from the end of June until that date at the end of December, in my view actually, as I can tell you, could not have been for no-fault insurance.

You might stand over there and say that you are not going to take my word for it. We're past the hour, but I'll try to bring back the statement for the hon. member, without accepting any of his political accusations, without accepting any of them. What I told him tonight is a fact, whether he wants to accept it or not.

Mr. Singer: All right, as long as the section isn't passed, because I may have a word to say a little later on.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'm sure you will.

Mr. Singer: You're probably right

An hon. member: You won't be the only one.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Why don't you speak to the cabinet?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I do, but you are not there and never will be.

Mr. Lewis: Not in your cabinet. We don't want to be.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh, sorry.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask what we are doing?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I think I stated earlier in the week that tomorrow we would be in supply on the estimates of the Ministry of Education.

Mr. Lewis: Wouldn't you like to clean up the insurance bill tomorrow morning?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It seems clean enough.

Mr Lewis: For purposes of continuity?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:33 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 25, 1972

Ontario Development Corporation Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, second reading 2813

Northern Ontario Development Corporation Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, second reading 2822

Insurance Act, bill to amend, in committee 2822

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2835

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Friday, May 26, 1972

No. 72

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, May 26, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1972

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have visitors with us today in the east gallery who are students—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Not in the government benches, anyway.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): We have got more on our side.

Mr. Speaker: We have visitors with us today, who are: Students from St. Anthony's School of Harrow in the east gallery; and in the west gallery, St. Joseph Island Central and Tarbutt Central Schools of Richards Landing, and the 61st Toronto Girl Guide Company of Scarborough. We are supposed to have, in both galleries—I presume they are a little late—students from Burlington Central High School of Burlington.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What ministry do you have in mind?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, maybe we ought to have an "Ontario Housing day" again, something like that. A "Justice day?" Do you think we better have a "Justice day" instead?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): A "farm day" too.

OHC ADVERTISING

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a matter of fact, I would like to ask the minister in charge of housing whether he has embarked on a new advertising programme. What prompts this, of course, is the full-page ad today concerning Home Ownership Made Easy.

Secondly, in the ad there is reference to the 10,000 or 12,000 acres in the land bank. Is the minister implying in that ad that these lands are going to be developed for housing in those communities where the land is well known to be held by the government, but certainly no development of housing has been indicated? As a matter of fact, local planning authorities would not permit it under present circumstances.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the particular ad regarding land assembly the hon. leader is speaking of; at least I don't recall it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is a HOME ad.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, the Home Ownership Made Easy plan has a programme of advertising. Essentially, the main thrust of it is to make condominiums more acceptable to the public, particularly in view of the fact that this is the season for looking for new accommodation. Obviously if condominiums have more public acceptance it will provide more vacancies to take up some of the slack; which we are looking for.

As to the land assembly programme, I would have to see one of the ads before I could comment on it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, as a supplementary, and really for clarification, according to the minister the ad itself is supposed to emphasize the acceptability, let us say, of condominium living; and yet the minister is not aware that the main picture in the ad is one of these little vine-covered bungalows with a family of three—the man and the woman, the father with his hand on his son's head. It is certainly emphasizing single-family dwellings, and the implication is that all you have to do is phone your friendly minister of housing and you too can have one of these.

Mr. Speaker: I am trying to detect some interrogation—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in order to make that into a question, I can't see why the minister is once again embarking on a programme of using public funds for advertising when the purpose is so obscure.

Wouldn't the minister also agree that in those communities where public housing is very short indeed—I don't particularly mean

Metro Toronto; we have had that discussion on several occasions—where the reference to land being held for housing is repeated there is a tendency to, let us say, stimulate public expectation. I think this is very misleading indeed, according to any plans of the government that I have heard of.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it clear that the main thrust of the advertising is to make condominiums more acceptable to the public, to make it clear that condominium ownership is a very advantageous thing for people who are looking for accommodation.

I have just had the ad shown to me; it is not advertising by me nor by my ministry, it is advertising by the Ontario Housing Corp. I don't see any possible implication that one should phone the friendly minister, because there is a coupon here which—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That would be false advertising.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They have learned that.

Mr. Gaunt: That was the ad before.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I think the coupons have been the same in every ad.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): All you need is six box tops.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is addressed to the Ontario Housing Corp., 101 Bloor St. W.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is in charge of that, I understand.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am not in charge; I only answer to the Legislature for the Ontario Housing Corp.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The minister gives pretty poor answers, too.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It invites readers to send in "for information on the many ways OHC can help you"; and to mail this coupon to the Ontario Housing Corp., 101 Bloor St. W. It doesn't say anything about the Ministry of Revenue, let alone the minister.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): What do you do with the coupons?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They send out a picture of the minister.

Mr. Singer: Signed: "Your friendly minister."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Although, now that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has mentioned it, perhaps it would be a good idea to put the minister's name in there in 2-in type. If he thinks this will be helpful, I will discuss this and find out if I can hold up this programme until I can get my name put on, as the hon. leader feels I should.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, does the minister not have any qualms about the boosting of condominiums in view of the very great concern that many people, including local councils such as that of the borough of North York, have about the efficiency and integrity of the condominium system? Does the minister know that many people have had very sad experiences when they have bought condominiums, for a variety of reasons which have been expressed most recently by the borough of North York in a unanimous motion?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't agree that many people have expressed a concern about the condominium concept. We know that there are many who have some concern about them. I don't remember seeing a resolution from any of the boroughs, either.

Mr. Singer: It's on its way to the minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well. if it's on its way to me, the hon. member has advance information, but—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It was in the press, for heaven's sake!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't spend all my days reading the press. In fact, I wasn't—

Mr. Lewis: No, I am sure the minister doesn't. If he did he would change his policy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I hadn't even seen this one until it was handed to me.

Mr. Reid: The minister might like to find out what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ministers have other work to do, too.

Mr. Lewis: What work does this minister do? He doesn't build houses. What else does he do?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: He doesn't have a rent subsidy programme—68,000 houses in 6½ years. What a figure he has latched onto!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course we don't! Only about, what is it?—68,000. Nothing at all!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): We have built 68,000 houses; more than any other jurisdiction in North America—68,000.

Mr. Speaker: This is completely out of order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a wandering dissertation, not a response to a question.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. minister will proceed with his answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps the opposition may let me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Reid: Will he start with the answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You know, Parkinson's law is at work here; there is time for questions and even if they are not interested, they are going to fill in the time. If they want to fill it in, I'll do it anyway.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister certainly knows how to do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, we wouldn't be stressing the condominium concept if we weren't interested in advising the public that it is a good concept, as indeed it is. We have an interest, of course, in making sure that housing which is available is taken up. To the extent that we can do this, it will help us provide accommodation for others who are awaiting accommodation.

Mr. Sargent: When is the minister going to resign?

Mr. Lewis: That is a good supplementary!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I'll tell the hon. member who asked me that last question—the one day that he gets up and asks an intelligent question, I may consider resigning. That should keep me here for a long time.

An hon. member: He'll be here a long time!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? Right!

Mr. Cassidy: I'd just like to ask the minister, since he would agree that advertising helps to increase or at least to find the need and demand for certain products—and therefore can justify something like this—whether he will consider advertisng the OHC's public housing programme in order to determine what is the real need for public housing and not just the need that is identified by word of mouth—

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): We thought the member knew.

Mr. Cassidy: —so that people can find out whether or not they can get it.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): The member is supplying the answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just as soon as the member can make any sense out of that question, if he'll help me, I'll be glad to answer.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: In the matter of public housing, will the minister consider a review of the method of calculating geared-to-income rental to take into account such things as the increases in other factors that contribute to the cost of living?

Mr. Speaker: I hardly think that is supplementary to the original question.

Mr. Deans: I think it is important.

Mr. Speaker: It may be, but I hardly think it is supplementary to the original question.

Mr. Deans: No?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

STUDY OF PERFORMANCE LOAN PROGRAMME

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism, if I might have his attention for a moment. When he was discussing dropping performance loan payments to other than Canadian controlled companies, was it also a matter of discussion, as he has indicated it might well be in the future, that the whole performance loan programme itself would be dropped?

Therefore, the minister's statement yesterday that performance loan funds are going to be payable only to Canadian controlled corporations might very well not be much advantage to them if the whole programme is going to be drawing to a close.

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): I wouldn't want to predict the outcome of that, Mr. Speaker. I have wondered aloud on a dozen occasions or more—several times in this Legislature—whether the relatively small amount of resources made available by the Legislature to the ODC might not be better expended through straight loans or guaranteed bank loans or some new form of loan insurance. We went into that rather thoroughly in the Legislature during my estimates. I had rather hoped that the ODC bill would be passed and a new ODC would be appointed by June 1, in which case I was going to ask them to consider this as top priority, and then work their way through other policies and programmes. But because the bill is not through and because the new board is not in place, I thought as a temporary measure it would be appropriate to suspend performance loans for foreign controlled corporations

Mr. Lewis: Without announcing it to the Legislature; just a light little cabinet meeting!

Hon. Mr. White: And I thus recommended to my cabinet colleagues the day before yesterday. I so instructed the ODC officials yesterday; and yesterday I informed the Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, he sure did.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: We assume there is no change in the availability of the pool of funds for performance loans and that we can expect many more loans, then, to be announced to Canadian controlled corporations; or in fact will the study simply suspend all decision until an overall decision has been reached?

Hon. Mr. White: No, Mr. Speaker, I would anticipate the applications from Canadian controlled corporations for performance loans to continue as in the past. There is no separate pool for performance loans; it is all in the one item; if I'm not mistaken. So whether the increment will go into performance loans or term loans is not forecastable.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the minister tell us what he understands by the phrase foreign ownership? Does it mean actual physical ownership in the United States; or would it include a Canadian company, an Ontario company in fact, owned in substantial proportion by other than Canadian people?

Hon. Mr. White: My suggestion to the ODC is going to be that they use the same guidelines as those determined by the federal government with respect of a screening review process.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister be humble enough to admit that his change of policy was the result of a cartoon in the Toronto Star the other day?

Mr. MacDonald: There is an intelligent question.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I didn't see that cartoon, so I guess it didn't weigh heavily on my decision.

CONVERSION OF AIRCRAFT FOR FIREFIGHTING

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Because of the very high forest fire hazard and the incidence of forest fires out of control in northern and northwestern Ontario—I guess northeastern Ontario particularly, around Kirkland Lake—has he requested that the Otter plane with executive configuration that's kept down at the waterfront be converted for water bombing—as we were told it could be when the plane was bought—and that it be sent up to the north for more useful assistance in controlling the forest fire situation.

Mr. MacDonald: There are more fires to put out down here than up there.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): In answer to that question, Mr. Speaker: No, I have not requested this. We appear to have sufficient aircraft of this type to do a job. I will say that we are having extreme difficulty in getting sufficient manpower to fight the fires. We have a 100-acre fire now out of control in the Thunder Bay area, just southwest—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How many others?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: One fire of 100 acres southwest of Armstrong; and another one that is out of control, 1,500 acres in the Geraldton area; and at Swastika, about 4,000 acres in the Matachewan area.

Mr. Reid: How about Quetico Park?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And as far as aircraft are concerned we appear to have sufficient, but we are being taxed by a shortage of manpower.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: I wonder if the minister could tell the House how many of the aircraft that are attached to his department are used for purposes other than specifically the control of forest fires? If they are used for let's say executive transportation?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We have about three that are used for executive transportation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Surely it would be a proper application of the public funds that have purchased those planes that during the season for forest fires they may be made more readily available? Are we to understand the minister correctly when he says that he couldn't use more water-bombing facilities—the planes, with pilots, equipped?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, one has to realize that you don't change an executive type aircraft into a waterbomber overnight. But if there is a need—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister said it was very convenient to do if he bought the plane.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —but if there is a need to use these aircraft for the movement of manpower, we will do that immediately and that will have first preference over the movement of executives.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Surely the hon. member can wait until the answer is given before there is a supplementary presented.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary: Does the minister intend to continue the express service carrying all his buddies every weekend in the King Air from the Island Airport to the north? How long is this going to go on?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Fires are burning!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this matter has been discussed in the House before and the policy of the ministers using air transport has been clearly enunciated.

Mr. Sargent: What is the policy of the government with regard to aircraft?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have a further question?

Mr. Reid: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Would the minister make it a point to report to the Legislature on the status of fire hazards in the entire province on some kind of a regular basis, so that those of us who are interested can know what's going on?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be only too pleased to do that. I might say to the member for Rainy River that we have a restriction on camp fires in northern Ontario as of last week, and this will continue until the fire hazard is reduced.

POLLUTION IN ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the same minister: Has he been informed of the flow of raw sewage into Canoe Lake in Algonquin Park? Has he taken this matter up with his colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), so that steps can be taken to stop this gross pollution of one of the fine lakes in our provincial park system?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this matter has come to my attention. I would report to the House that on April 26 it came to the department's attention. We brought it to the attention of the officials of the Ministry of the Environment and we also had a member of the Ministry of Government Services in attendance who visited the area.

At that particular time, the north berm of the lagoon was showing signs of weakness and it was decided, after consultation with the official of the Ministry of the Environment, that the amount of effluent, which was very clear and showed no odour, should be lessened, and a spray technique was used.

However, this still caused some concern, because the area was covered with one to two feet of snow. So a discharge pipe was opened on the advice of the Ministry of the Environment and for a period of April 28 to May 5 this discharge was allowed to go into Canoe Lake. I'm informed that the bacterial content of the effluent was well within the Ministry of the Environment's standards, and that the danger was not what it was reported to be in the recent editorial of a Toronto paper. The situation has been stopped and there will be no need to carry out any further effluent discharge.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Oh, go ahead.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Whose responsibility was it, or is it, to inspect those facilities and see that they're kept in good shape before they get to the point where they're going to contaminate as seriously as this one has, and may in the future? Is it shared with the Ministry of the Environment, the local health officials, or since it is in a provincial park does it lie almost exclusively with the minister who's answering?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Our ministry accepts that responsibility, and of course we co-operate very closely with the Ministry of the Environment on such matters as this; and we will continue to monitor those matters.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Was the Ministry of the Environment informed that in fact Lands and Forests was going to open the pipe and allow the discharge to go through?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, we were. It was on the advice of the chief sanitary engineer of the Ministry of Government Services that the pipe was opened. I have his name here, Mr. O. Kurcigs.

Mr. Reid: The gentleman from Sudbury.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have a further question? The hon. member for Scarborough West.

STUDY OF PERFORMANCE LOAN PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: Just before the Minister of Industry and Tourism leaves, Mr. Speaker, a very brief question of him: Is he aware at the moment of the numbers of loans and dollar amounts in what's now called the performance loan programme, which his ministry is now reviewing for both foreign controlled and Canadian corporations?

Hon. Mr. White: The applications we have on hand, but which have not been concluded? I'll get that information. There's just a small number—perhaps half a dozen—but I'll find out precisely for the Legislature.

EMERGENCY MEASURES BRANCH

Mr. Lewis: Thank you. A question, I guess of the Chairman of the Management Board: Does he know whether or not the planning officer, emergency measures, has yet been hired for the emergency measures branch of the Ministry of the Solicitor General?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): The position has been advertised but I can't say whether or not the actual recruitment has been made as yet.

Mr. Lewis: Can he tell me, when it says in the job description:

> Planning Officer, Emergency Measures: Will assist in the development, implementation and evaluation of various activities of the civil emergency measures programme, to deal with wartime emergencies and natural disasters.

Which wartime emergencies did the minister have in mind in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suppose that could be considered general. I would have to say, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Where is the invasion coming from? What does the minister anticipate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have seen a number of abortive ones from that side of the House.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I hesitate to give the answer that comes readily to mind, Mr. Speaker. I will simply say this, that the Civil Service Commission places the advertisements; the Management Board itself has nothing to do with the content of the ads.

Mr. Cassidy: But the Board is responsible for it.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister think, by way of supplementary, that we should be paying $10,000 a year, in a time of government austerity when the government is cutting back on all kinds of social programmes, to hire people to plan for wartime emergencies in Ontario?

Is he going to tell us the wartime emergencies that the cabinet discussed before the ad went in? What does the minister have in mind?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that all emergencies need to be categorized as wartime emergencies.

Mr. Lewis: No, but that is what the ad says. I agreed that there is a standing emergency on the other side which isn't wartime.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think I can remember some prominent person in this Legislature at one time saying, in time of peace prepare for war. That was in another context but—

Mr. Lewis: Is that what the government is doing—preparing for war?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not in a position to—

Mr. Lewis: The minister is not in a position to tell us which war?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not in a position to indicate the context of what is in that ad. The Civil Service Commission writes them on the request of the department.

Mr. Lewis: The minister had better have a look at the Civil Service Commission.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member having mentioned it, I will.

LAND PURCHASES FOR HIGHWAY 406

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications how it is that his department is purchasing land on the possible route of Highway 406 into and out of St. Catharines, when that route itself is only now open for public hearings and feasibility?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that came about in the following way. There had been an offer submitted to one of the individual parties concerned back in March, which was prior to the public hearings having been set up.

Subsequent to that, the offer was accepted by the individuals concerned and the surveyors went in to survey the property to make sure they were getting good title. At that time, the next door owner became upset because they thought they were surveying for future purposes. This was not the case. In fact, I have been informed that all action ceased, other than in that one case, after the public hearings were announced. It is our intention that nothing happen until the public hearings are ended.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: How can the government build in the public mind a feeling of confidence with regard to any meaningful association in the hearing for feasibility and public need when the minister has confessed, as did the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) yesterday in the Pickering instance, that he is buying land before the hearing has been held? This is a common practice.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this came about because of the fact that it was I who instituted the public hearings in this particular case dealing with Highway 406. As I explained—

Mr. MacDonald: After the department started to buy?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am not certain of the timetabling of events. I can assure this Legislature that public hearings are in order before any plans are made. That is the present policy, I am not certain when this started or as to the timetable of events some one year or two years ago.

Mr. Lewis: Probably just before the minister took office, I suspect.

Mr. MacDonald: Speak to the provincial Treasurer.

METRO HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Revenue, Mr. Speaker: How is it that of the 20,330 active applications on file in Metropolitan Toronto for housing, that nearly 13,000 of them, that is two-thirds of them, have not yet received a home visit? What is the problem in the department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't necessarily agree that all the 20,000 are active.

Mr. Lewis: It says active applications—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who said?

Mr. Lewis: It said it in the housing registry for Metropolitan Toronto put out by the Ontario Housing Corp.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When was that?

Mr. Lewis: When was it? It was released about 48 hours ago and it says active applications.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it's—

Mr. Lewis: Good enough? Good enough for the minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Touché! The member made his point. I am saying this, that there are different interpretations of what active

applications are. These are people who have put their names down as wanting accommodation.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh come on!

Mr. Lewis: The minister lists the emergency cases through investigation by his own staff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The policy is that anyone who has made an application is put down as an applicant. They are checked from time to time, and so long as they are still interested, they are understood to be applicants.

Now, what was the second part of the question?

Mr. Lewis: I wanted to know why two-thirds of them have not even received a home visit.

Mr. MacDonald: And that was the question!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Speaker, if is again a repetition of questions that have been asked previously and have been answered previously.

Mr. Cassidy: No!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course it is; of course they have been answered previously. If the hon. member will look up Hansard, he will find out—

Mr. Lewis: Will the minister answer again?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What's the point of going into the same thing day in and day out? The fact remains that in the first place if we were to send out interviewers every time an application comes in, we would need all of our staff, and perhaps even additional staff, just for the purpose of hustling back and forth—

Mr. Lewis: A very good idea!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will just wait.

On the fact of what is in an application it is obvious to the people in OHC that these do not have any priority. Where it appears that there is a matter of urgency and they should be getting priority as to interviews, these people are interviewed quickly. The hon. member knows that because he is aware of such cases.

"They just cannot send hundreds of people out hustling about, checking up the applications merely on the basis that they have made an application. Those who appear to need immediate attention are interviewed, and I have the information here that I gave to the hon. member the other day when he asked for details of it. I tell him that those people in need and who appear to be the kind of people we can look after and should be given top priority are given top priority.

Mr. Deans: How do you decide without seeing them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I should also tell the hon. member that just because a person happens to have been put on the top priority list a week ago, two weeks ago, three months ago or six months ago, doesn't mean there are others who haven't been put in a higher priority since that time because of an emergency that has occurred.

Mr. Lewis: I understand, yes. They have to wait 18 to 42 months.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course, that's right. But where it is at all possible we look after those urgent ones first, those who we are expected to look after because of our terms of reference.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: Has the minister read the report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I haven't.

Mr. Lewis: Well, when he gets around to reading the report from his own department, perhaps he might look at table 8 and explain why, when clearly 70 per cent of the applications are in the critical point category, his department still only manages to provide home visits for a third of the total applications?

How does that happen? Where is the lack? What is the problem with staff?

Mr. MacDonald: As a supplementary, is it not more accurate to say that people aren't sent out for the home visits because you haven't got a house even when you have visited them?

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I don't agree with that. We don't have all the houses or all the accommodation we would like to have, and we obviously can't—

Mr. Lewis: It is the best programme in the world, but there are not enough houses!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is why so many people want to get into it!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member certainly must know that if it was at all possible to look after these 20,000 people tomorrow, we would probably have another 20,000 applying the day after that.

Mr. MacDonald: You're right!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Everyone wants to improve their conditions. Why shouldn't they?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This debate is quite out of order.

Mr. Deans: Every year for four years the minister has failed to spend his budget.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

The hon. Minister of Revenue has the answer to a question asked previously.

Interjections by hon. members.

OHC PURCHASE OF HYDRO LAND

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it is OHC again!

Mr. Speaker, on May 18, the hon. member for Scarborough West asked whether it was true that the 42 houses on the Hydro site had stood vacant for more than a year.

Mr. Lewis: The minister answered that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I indicated at that time that I believed the hon. member was mistaken. I also said I would make a point of finding out exactly how many of the houses are, in fact, vacant. Currently, 26 of the 41 properties are rented. The others were boarded up by Hydro when an assessment of their condition at that time indicated they couldn't be rehabilitated to even minimum standards at an economic cost. This is substantially the same situation as existed on September 1, 1971, except that one has since been condemned after the death of the tenant. I understand it was occupied by one person and because of her age they didn't want to put her out so they left her there at that time. I think this is essentially the information I gave from memory to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications also has the answer to a previous question.

DRIVING TESTS

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question by the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) with respect to driver re-examination. It concerns itself with the policy regarding a driver who has three accidents within two years.

I am informed that this has been the policy since the 1940s and it is not just in the case of the driver who has had three accidents within two years; it also is in effect where other factors are involved.

In the case the member was concerned about, the driver had had collisions in 1965, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972. In addition he had speeding charges in 1966, 1967; a stop sign in 1967; disobeying a red signal light in 1971; and a prohibited turn in 1972. Having regard to these factors—

Mr. MacDonald: The case is made.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —that is why there was a re-examination.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

MANAGEMENT OF CNE AND ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications if he didn't feel this was a little unfair, but I won't.

I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Tourism whichever—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Industry and Tourism.

Mr. Reid: Industry and Tourism! Has he had any discussions with the directors or board of management of the CNE with a view to appointing one director or general manager for both Ontario Place and the CNE?

Hon. Mr. White: I had a brief discussion, Mr. Speaker, on this subject with Mr. Ab Campbell. At that time I suggested—and the suggestion was agreed to—that we set up a liaison committee consisting of six or seven people, half coming from the CNE and half

coming from the Ontario Place advisory committee, chaired by the Metro chairman. We think the time may come when it will be wise to have one executive officer for both facilities, but at the present time, for a number of reasons, we think it is premature and inadvisable and that is not our intention.

Mr. Reid: By way of supplementary, if I may, would the minister share his feelings on why it would be inadvisable? By way of further supplementary, can he indicate what, if any, contribution the Province of Ontario makes to the CNE? Thirdly, what kind of money figures are we talking about for the general manager of Ontario Place and the general manager of the CNE?

Hon. Mr. White: It seems to me, having passed a bill in this House in the last few weeks establishing a new board of directors for the new Crown corporation called Ontario Place, that this kind of decision should be made by that board. That is the principal reason that I didn't want to pre-empt that particular change, or make that particular decision.

We have advertised for a new general manager of Ontario Place. We have something like 190 applications, which we are going to put in front of the new board as soon as it is appointed. which I hope will be within a week or so. The amount mentioned in the advertisement calling for applications was $25,000 plus. I am not sure, but I think the CNE has a similar salary range in mind for its general manager.

Mr. Reid: If I may, Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary: How much does the province contribute, if anything, to the Canadian National Exhibition? Is there a grant made to them by this government?

Hon. Mr. White: I am not aware of any grant as such. There is a form of subsidization, I suppose one could say, because of the exhibits and the Ontario building and such like, but I am not aware of a grant per se.

Mr. Reid: Excuse me, one more supplementary: The Ontario government does appoint some people to sit on the board of directors of the CNE, does it not.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes.

Mr. Reid: Well, they must be giving them something.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS IN THUNDER BAY

Mr. Foulds: I have a question of the Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that a public meeting was held last night in Thunder Bay regarding the location of the mini-Queen's Park, and in view of the fact that the opinion of that meeting, at which representatives of all political parties were present, was that the minister should hold public hearings in Thunder Bay regarding the site, is he prepared to postpone a final decision on that location until he has had such a public meeting, along with the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) and perhaps myself, the member for Port Arthur, and any other elected representatives, so that the people in the area can have a genuine input and participation in the decision on that site?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the public meeting last night and I have had no report from it. I have had a great deal of correspondence from residents of Thunder Bay, which I am in the process of assessing at the present time. I intend to go back to Thunder Bay myself, probably within the next two to three weeks, to meet with the elected officials there and try to come to some finalization on a site for this proposed building.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister consider a public meeting during his visit so that the people could have some input into it?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a great deal of input from the public. I am quite prepared to receive any letters from any member of the public. I don't think it is necessary to have a public hearing. I can, I am sure, deal with the elected representatives of that municipality.

Mr. Foulds: A last supplementary then: Would the minister advise the people who wish to participate to send him letters or briefs or something of that sort, in view of the fact that he won't have a public hearing?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I am very sure that all the people of Thunder Bay are aware there is a post office and what my address is. A great many of them are aware anyway, because I have received a great many letters already.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

BICYCLE PATHS

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In light of the tremendous popularity of bicycling and the fact that people of all ages now are taking to bicycling; and in light of the fact that the summer season is approaching and more and more will be using our highways to indulge in their favourite pastime of bicycling: Is the minister planning to designate certain highways on which bicycles would be permitted? Is he planning on a system of bicycle trails to enable individuals to follow certain routes as they pursue their favourite pastime?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I have had one or two submissions with respect to bicycle paths relative to local areas. It is a matter that my ministry really has not studied in any depth, but it is certainly something worth looking at. Insofar as the highways are concerned, I rather doubt that any of the King's highways, for example, would be utilized for cycling, but in any event we shall study the matter.

Mr. Singer: Roads are for people, not for cars.

Mr. Deacon: Supplementary: Has the minister studied the report of the Trails Association which is operated in co-operation with the conservation authorities branch and the Council of Conservation Authorities, which recommends some use of provincial highways in certain areas to try out proposed trails?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I received that, Mr. Speaker, and it is being studied by my ministry.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

KIDNAPPING OF LEIGH ANN BEDARD

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Why did his department issue instructions on March 23 last to the Crown attorney's office that they were not to interfere in the kidnapping of one Leigh Ann Bedard?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): What? Advice was given not to interfere in a kidnapping?

Is the member suggesting an actual kidnapping took place; and they were aware of it?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I am not aware of the circumstances, but I'll find out.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet may I reply to a question previously raised by—

Mr. Speaker: It would be better if the hon. minister would wait until I called him, in order to keep the alternating programme. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: My minister has left.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General may give his reply.

USE OF ALIAS

Hon. Mr. Bales: The member for High Park raised a question in the Legislature last Friday in reference to a person using an alias in court. On March 8, David Warren Wilson, whose real name has been revealed in the newspapers and in court as Reddy—and that is his real name—was in touch with the Metropolitan police force and confessed to a series of armed robberies in Toronto and in Montreal. The accused asked the police to allow him to use an alias in order that a close relative in his family who was seriously ill would not be aware of the charges. On humanitarian grounds the police agreed to that.

However, they advised the accused that the alias was for court purposes only and his previous court record under his correct name would be revealed to the judge prior to sentence. Similarly, his real name would be used on the police record. The Crown attorney was made aware of the circumstances.

The accused pleaded guilty to the charges at the beginning of this week, and was sentenced to 10 years concurrent on all charges. Due to the publicity that was given to this matter previously, the correct name was used in court.

The Crown officials have checked into the matter as to whether the suggestion of serious illness in his family was correct and the officials are satisfied that such is the case.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

UPDATING CAR REGISTRATIONS

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications? I would

ask the minister does he not feel that he is party to fraud when he allows automobile manufacturers and dealers to update last year model cars on the registration so as to misrepresent them as this year model cars?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I don't feel in any way that I am party to any fraud. I'm not aware that this is taking place; and certainly if this is taking place, I would imagine the federal government in Ottawa would be concerned about this.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that the federal government has recommended to the provinces that this practice of updating last year model cars be discontinued by the provinces?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I was not aware of that, Mr. Speaker. I am now.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Reports.

Motions.

Introductions of bills.

Before the orders of the day, I should point out to the hon. members that today is the last day of service for the present group of pages. As has been the custom in the past, we like to read into the record the names of those young persons who have served us so well in this Legislature.

The last group of pages include: Jonathan Arnold of Toronto in the riding of York-Forest Hill; Gordon Beaton of Scarborough in the riding of Scarborough West; Michael Campbell of Oakville in the riding of Halton East; John Chamberlain of Oakville in the riding of Halton East; Michael Chatterton of Southampton in the riding of Grey-Bruce; Jennifer Cook of Meaford in the riding of Grey South; Ashley Gonsalves of Scarborough in the riding of Scarborough West; Julia Goss of Whitby in the riding of Ontario South; George Harrison of Mississauga in the riding of Peel South; Patricia Hose of Toronto in the riding of Eglinton; Isabel Klopchick of Toronto in the riding of Eglinton; Paul McNiece of Aylmer in the riding of Elgin; Karen Mably of Willowdale in the riding of Armourdale; Fraser Mitchell of Weston in the riding of Etobicoke; Colin Pryer of Kitchener in the riding of Kitchener; Sandra Rosch of Mississauga in the riding of Peel South; Robert Routcliffe of Sarnia in the riding of Sarnia; James Simone of River Canard in the riding of Essex South; Ruth Turnbull of Islington in the riding of York West; and Marjorie Visser of Ingersoll in the riding of Oxford.

That constitutes the last group of pages who have served us extremely well.

At this time I should also mention that there are numerous other school groups coming in who are supposed to be here at 11 o'clock and at 12. I have been requested to announce them at this time.

In the east gallery at 11 o'clock we will have students from Bright's Grove School of Bright's Grove, St. Jean de Baptiste School of Belle River; in the west gallery, the Holy Rosary School of Wyoming and the Brooke-Alvinston Central School of Alvinston. At 12 noon in the east gallery, Maidstone Central School of Maidstone; the Annandale High School of Tillsonburg, and in the west gallery, South Marysburg Central School of Picton. The long list is the reason I did not announce them all at the beginning.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to table answers to questions one, two, three, four, seven and eight, standing on the order paper. [See appendix, page 2872.]

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that His Honour awaits without.

ROYAL ASSENT

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 86, An Act to amend the Ministry of Community and Social Services Act.

Bill 109, An Act to control Pyramid Methods for the Distribution and Sale of Commodities.

Bill 117, An Act to amend the Children's Institutions Act.

Bill 129, An Act to regulate Riding Horse Establishments.

Bill 130, An Act to amend the Dead Animal Disposal Act.

Bill 134, An Act to amend the Charitable Institutions Act.

Bill 135, An Act to amend the Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act.

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the University of Waterloo.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. Hodgson in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: Page 286.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. E. Foulds (Port Arthur): On a point of order, isn't it the usual practice to alternate the speakers?

Mr. Chairman: We will alternate the next time around.

Mr. Foulds: Didn't the dynamic member—

Mr. Chairman: No, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has the floor.

Mr. Foulds: I am on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Didn't the dynamic member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) get to his feet on Tuesday night and lead off for the Liberal Party?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Oh, now you are being mean and suspicious.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I don't think you have any point of order. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Foulds: I thought it was a very pungent comment.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2201, item 1.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, as I rise to present the Liberal point of view on the Department of Education may I first extend to the minister (Mr. Wells) my congratulations on his appointment as Minister of Education.

This apparently is the third portfolio the minister has been assigned. He has been Minister of Health, Minister of Social and Family Services—now Community and Social Services—and is now the Minister of Education. I surely hope, Mr. Chairman, that he remains the Minister of Education for a few more years at least, so that he will familiarize himself with the problems and the difficulties that education is going through these days and so that he will be able to realize that probably the main difficulty today is the attempt on the part of municipalities to raise sufficient funds to pay for the ever rising costs of education.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to congratulate the minister on the legislation he introduced the other day and which we discussed just yesterday. The approach used by the department was forward-looking and it is the type of approach that should have been used years ago.

I assume that the minister's experience as a member of a board of education, plus the fact that youth was on his side, gave him a little more rational approach to the whole problem. However, I hope that now he is the minister he will continue the same approach and that we in education can look forward to much brighter days than those we have had.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest the other night to the minister's opening remarks. He made mention throughout his remarks of the quality of education. Apparently the whole tenor of his remarks was the quality rather than quantity of education. I would like then, Mr. Chairman, to use his comments and base some of my replies on them.

On page 2 of his comments, he makes mention that once things settled, and school budgets were finally set, it quickly became clear that none of the talk about drastic staff cuts or large increases in class size had materialized. According to the statistics provided to me by our research staff, I would like to bring to the minister's attention, how these ceilings have and will affect education. The spending ceilings are going to have a substantial effect on the quality of education over the next few years. The pupil-teacher ratio can't help but increase throughout the

province because of the number of teachers not necessarily being laid off, but retiring and not being replaced.

The measures, that is, budget cuts, are going to have their greatest effects on small schools. One example is the Hayden Park Vocational School, a girl's school for slow learners. The information provided to me was it would have a staff of 45 this year and that staff was going to be cut by some 11 in the ensuing year. The cut, as I made mention, may not necessarily mean that 11 teachers are going to be retired, but 11 teachers who leave that school system may not be replaced.

This cut is a result of the combination of spending ceilings and also a dropping enrolment. Class size and range of courses will be severely affected. I understand they will not have a librarian next year. The course in theatre arts has been cancelled and there will not be as much guidance and counselling available to the girls. The unfortunate thing is that there will be more girls in a class, reducing the amount of time a teacher can spend on any one individual. Slow learners need individual attention and this can only be done in a small class. This is just one unfortunate example of how spending ceilings will affect the kind of education a student will receive.

The guidance facilities in the province today are not adequate. In 1970, there was one guidance counsellor for 313 senior secondary school students. In 1971, this rose to one counsellor for 323 students. Now, with the larger pupil-teacher ratios, the schools will feel that they can't afford as many guidance counsellors and the ratio of students to counsellors will, no doubt, rise.

Working with 1971 figures, with one counsellor for 323 students, and approximately 430 minutes in a school week, every student could see a guidance counsellor for approximately five minutes every four weeks. This year, Mr. Chairman, the credit system will be universal throughout the secondary schools in Ontario. Because there are no compulsory subjects, students now will need more time for guidance as to what choices they should make. May I ask the minister, is five minutes every four weeks enough time? The number of guidance counsellors will be decreased rather than increased at a time when students need them most, especially in this transitional period.

Forest Hill Collegiate, I understand, is going to lose approximately 11.5 teachers. They will not be able to expand programmes that are in great demand, that is, the theatre arts, the arts and music. They will not be able to offer a course in Hebrew this coming year. Class sizes are going to be increased by up to 20 per cent. In the junior high school, the staff of 30 teachers will be reduced to 25, with a corresponding rise in class size and the curtailment of options. Industrial arts and home economics for grade 7 will be affected.

In Etobicoke, no teachers are being fired; however, several teachers have resigned from their teaching positions and are not being replaced. This will mean that the teachers who are left at the school may be required to teach subjects that they are not specialized in.

If the students are lucky, the new teacher may have studied that subject as a minor, but chances are they will be completely new to the subject they are teaching; and this could be a bad set-back to the quality of education in Etobicoke.

It is assumed when a teacher is imparting facts or ideas to a class, he has had some previous experience with those facts or ideas. Next year this may not be the case. Imagine what would happen if a physical education teacher, the music and the art teacher resigned. How could anyone, without extensive training in these areas, teach high school students. A high quality of education can be maintained only if all teachers are specialists in a given area.

As I made mention, much of the decrease in staff is going to be as a result of teachers retiring and replacements not being hired for them. The minister did make mention, in comments to the Halton Home and School Association just recently, of the quality of education and the headline reads: "Stop Complaining, Tom Wells Says; Improve School Quality, Educators Told."

The fact that the minister had made mention of improving school quality is indicative that school quality was not what it should have been. The minister in his comments also makes mention that there must be better lines of communication between parents and educators; and their partnership in education may be affected if these lines of communication are broken.

May I bring to the minister's attention that the lines of communication are not necessarily lines that are completed. Parents quite often do complain to their boards of education, but the complaints may fall on deaf ears.

I can bring to the minister's attention the fact that two programmes in the city of Windsor—that is industrial arts and home economics programmes for grade 7—were

proposed to be discontinued. As soon as the parents heard of this they banded together and a Mrs. Madeline Weingarten, acting on behalf of many of the concerned parents, met with the board of education in an attempt to resolve the problem; hoping that both the industrial arts and home economics programmes would be continued.

However, in spite of the input that the concerned parents did make to the board, in spite of their great interest in the continuation of grade 7 industrial arts and home economics, the board curtailed the programme for grade 7. The only reason why the programme was curtailed was not because of the value of the programme, but because of budgetary ceilings. So you can see, Mr. Chairman, that budgetary ceilings have had, and will continue to have, an adverse effect on the quality of education.

Now the provincial ceilings, according to the minister's comments the other day, only placed a limit on the amount by which a school board's budget could be increased this year. We have not had budget cuts in Ontario education. We are aware of no boards that will have to spend less dollars per pupil in 1972 than they did in 1971.

However, Mr. Chairman, may I bring this to the attention of the minister to show that even though there may not have been budget cuts, the added responsibilities placed on boards, that is the added financial responsibilities, actually meant a curtailment of the amount of moneys that they could spend for the actual education and the actual teaching.

For example, in 1971 the elementary school grants were $545; in 1972 they go up to $595 for an increase of approximately nine per cent, and in 1973 they will go to $630 for an increase of six per cent over the previous year.

On the secondary level in the 1971 year the grant was $1,060 to the secondary schools; in 1972 it will rise by approximately four per cent to $1,100, and in 1973 it will rise by another three per cent to $1,130.

However, may I bring to the minister's attention that the increase in secondary school enrolment has been continuing whereas enrolment in the elementary schools keeps decreasing. If you want to make it fair, you would have to increase the grants at the secondary level to the same extent as the grants to the elementary level, to take care of the increasing population in the secondary schools. As I mentioned earlier, the boards have assumed greater responsibility and greater financial responsibility.

The qualifications of teachers, especially at the elementary level have increased. The teacher must have a university degree and as a result the cost of that teacher's services to a board has increased substantially with the new salary structure.

In addition there are increases in options at the secondary level. This means additional staff and, as a result, greater cost.

Just recently there was the consolidation of school boards which added a substantial cost to the school boards throughout the province. Students are once again staying in school a little longer because of the scarcity of employment. They can't get jobs and, as a result, stay in school.

All of this has added a substantial financial burden on the boards of education. It means that their dollars have to stretch into more areas and, as a result, means a curtailment of educational quality.

In addition to the few things that I mentioned, the other day the minister introduced legislation that would now permit boards of education to pay 100 per cent of the fringe benefits. This is an additional burden on school boards. If they are going to pay fringe benefits they are going to have to curtail in some other area to be able to meet their budgetary restrictions.

On page 4 of the minister's brief he mentions the weighting factors which take into consideration the special circumstances of individual boards as well as regional differences. May I bring to the attention of the minister a brief presented by the Welland County Roman Catholic Separate School Board.

This, I understand, was presented to the minister some time in February. Reading from page 3 of their brief they mention:

> The 1972 grant regulations favour the boards that have ample funds. In these grants there still is the fact that school boards that spend a great deal of money get larger grants. For example, to qualify for the provincial average for special education programmes a board must engage a certain number of persons. If a board has enough funds to hire psychiatrists, psychologists and other personnel in special education that board would reach the provincial level. But how do you strive at the high provincial average if you do not have the funds to start the cycle of reward grants? This means that the rich get richer.

> The Department of Education wants us to compete with the high-spending boards and the boards with ample tax resources. In 1971, the Welland County Roman Catholic Separate School Board spent approximately $400,000 for special education. yet we do not receive any weighting factor for this special education expenditure. It is not fair to group the small boards with the large city boards for determining averages. A graduated scale should be considered for this category.

Another unfair feature of the 1972 grant scheme is the fact that extra grants are paid to boards for maintenance of schools built before 1945. Many of the separate schools are new. The greatest expansion took place between 1950 and 1960. Separate school boards always try to build economical buildings in order to conform to the department's regulation of $20,000 per classroom, and later, $25,000 per classroom. The wealthy school boards exceeded the department's regulations and built more expensive and durable buildings. Buildings built in the 1950s at lower cost need repair too, and as result are not getting the financial assistance that they should; simply because they were built in 1950, were built cheaper, and repairs needed by them are substantially greater than they are for the more substantial buildings.

Now additional weighting factors might be considered for in-service programmes and the operation of the libraries. The board says that the ceiling for elementary schools—and this is a recommendation that it makes to the minister—should be at least two-thirds of the secondary school ceilings. Now that we have weighting factors for technical pupils and occupational pupils and for the experience and qualifications of teachers there is no need for such a wide spread between elementary and secondary ceilings.

I hope the minister will look into the brief presented by the Welland County Roman Catholic Separate School Board, take serious consideration of it and resolve the problem.

Next, I would like to get to the individualized curriculum emphasis. Today teachers are free to choose materials, subject of course to the budget and general arrangements by each school. Budgetary restrictions in boards don't prevent the teachers from recommending the use of certain books, but the boards will hesitate to purchase certain types of materials and books, using the comment that budgetary restrictions prevent the purchase of these additional materials.

Just recently the minister mailed to each of the secondary school teachers, Circular 14 and Circular 15. Now they are fairly substantial books; I would assume that all members of the Legislature have seen copies of the books. In my estimation they are very worthwhile books; I personally would make use of them were I back in teaching. However, I fail to see the need for providing every single faculty member of every single board with copies of the books. A half dozen copies would have been sufficient in each of the schools and if more were needed then I would think that the teachers would have inquired of the board and would have asked for additional copies.

Strange as it may seem the Toronto Globe and Mail editorializes in today's issue—I'm not going to read the editorial at all because I am positive that the minister and his officials know its contents, but it is extremely critical of the department for this; I sort of paraphrase—the horrible waste of funds in providing this circular and also Circular 14 to each and every teacher. They likewise make mention that possibly a half a dozen copies per school would have been sufficient.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): How about a course of study on the "big blue machine"?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It would be more interesting than studying the career of John Diefenbaker.

Mr. B. Newman: Returning to the minister's remarks; on page 17 he makes mention:

> Those of us who attended high school a decade or two ago, may find it difficult to imagine the topics on the curriculum actually leading to credits for a secondary school graduation diploma.

This is absolutely true, Mr. Minister; and especially is it true today. You claim that you have come along and provided quality education with this great variety of choice and with the new credit system, claiming that the credit system offers flexibility and it ensures that the students are equipped with a good grounding in basic skills and knowledge that will serve them well regardless of where their future leads them.

Under the credit system there is no core curriculum as such. In a fast-changing world it is impossible to predict in advance that any given core of basic subjects will provide the specific knowledge and skills that will be essential to the future.

Now, may I come along, Mr. Minister, and show you just exactly what the credit system may do. According to HS1, and I read:

> A student's programme at any given time should reflect his current state of development. [Now notice it says, "should reflect."] Each student must be permitted to select courses best suited to his interests, abilities and goals for the future. The credit system with individual timetables allows him to work at his own level in appropriate courses.

Now, it should do that, but let's see if it actually does that. A little later in my comments I will come along and point out just exactly what can be done with the credit system; not saying that it is done.

A student today requires only 27 credits to graduate. He must have at least one credit from each of the four areas of study in each of the first two years; that is, he would get eight credits for his first two years and at least one further credit after the first two years from each of the four areas. That gives him four more credits—four and eight are 12—and then a further 15 credits; the four areas being communications, social and environmental studies, pure and applied sciences, and arts. There are no compulsory subjects whatsoever now in the new credit system.

The present system will dilute the quality of education. Since no subjects are compulsory, many students—and I don't say all—but many students now may follow the path of least resistance. Their sole interest may be a secondary school graduation diploma.

Critics may have said that there are some courses that should be compulsory; and they mention French, Canadian history, politics and English. There is still a lot of room for choice, even were you to make some of those subjects compulsory. Personally, I would like to see Canadian history and English remain on the compulsory level.

In addition to that, being a physical education teacher at one time, I would include physical education attitude of the individual as well as the mental attitude.

Standards should be set high, making room for those with individual differences. Rather than setting the standards, the present approach lowers the quality of education. Many students may be opting for soft-data subjects; arts for example; rather than the hard-data subjects.

It is a known fact that the languages are dying. Very few students now in schools study Latin; more do French, though. With complete individualization of timetable, the former four-year students are getting lost in the system. Many are having serious identity problems.

Previously, a student had a home room and a group of students with whom he could identify. Students no longer belong to a group. Many of them are having difficulty in putting themselves into context. School spirit is not what it used to be, as is the competitive school spirit that used to exist in a home room. Students may reflect this in lower marks.

One of the problems, and that is the principal problem with this department, is that no one has ever outlined what the goals of education are. Perhaps the minister has some idea. I would think that before we complete the debate on his estimates that he should make some type of statement concerning the goals of education and relevant subjects that in his estimation should be made compulsory.

May I simply bring to the attention of the minister a course or a series of subjects that an individual could take to complete his secondary school graduation certification, receive a secondary school graduation diploma and only take one grade 12 subject—what we understand is grade 12, or the fourth level.

A person could take in his first year, seven grade 9 subjects: English, history, maths, science, phys-ed, air conditioning, and auto mechanics. In his second year he could take seven credits: English, history, mathematics, science, phys-ed, Italian and applied business machines. In his third year he could take four third-year subjects and three second-year subjects. The third-year subjects would be English, history, biology and physical and health education. The second-year subjects in his third year, so that he would receive seven credits, are typing, marketing and introduction to bookkeeping.

In his fourth year he would be taking only one fourth-year subject; that would be English. He would be taking or could be—I shouldn't say "would be"; I should say "could be" throughout—taking third year geography. Then he could be taking four first-year subjects, that is, mechanical drafting, electricity, graphic arts and small engines.

So, here you could have an individual graduating with a high school graduation diploma having taken 11 first-year subjects, 10 second-year subjects, five third-year subjects and one fourth-year subject. Yet the requirements for many jobs are a secondary

school graduation certificate. Which student would you accept in employment: One who had selected a course like that—and an individual could get his certification—or one who had gone through the regular stream and selected subject content from the level of the year in which he happened to be in the school, being in the first year, first-year subjects; second year, second-year, subjects; third year, third-year subjects and fourth year, fourth-year subjects? You can't tell me that the quality of education has improved with an individual taking that course. Yet that individual will receive the same certification as would one who had taken a far more complicated course.

In the Throne Speech the government did make mention, and I'm reading from the Throne Speech:

> My government will always seek ways to encourage the achievement of excellence in the many fields of citizen endeavour from which all Ontario people may draw inspiration and example.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, I have outlined a course that doesn't indicate any excellence whatsoever. It is an extremely mediocre, or maybe I could even say sub-mediocre, programme.

We always talk about the quality of education. The minister keeps insisting that it will improve. It is kind of strange that we talk about improving the quality of education when school after school, board after board, have more and more classes on remedial English, remedial mathematics, remedial reading.

For example, Richard Needham, a well-known Toronto Globe and Mail columnist, in a speech that he made to the Essex County Federation of Women Teachers Association just recently in the town of Harrow, makes mention that there are three necessities in life—to be able to speak, write and read one's own language clearly and correctly.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that the complete list of essential things?

Mr. B. Newman: And he says that schools are providing a baby sitting service to parents only. Surely, Mr. Minister, after the course that I outlined, you can't come along and say that quality of education is in the system to the extent that it should be?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is something the matter with that Needham.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think they are better now than they have ever been. They should come down here and speak.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You don't speak to them. There's that hard-working minister back with us.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, those are all the comments I have to make concerning the minister's speech. However, I would like to bring up several other topics, and the first one is the elimination of grade 13. The Hall-Dennis report on education and the Wright report on post-secondary education in Ontario both recommended the elimination of grade 13. The Wright report stated in recommendation 29:

> The present grade 13 standard of attainment should be available in 12 years, allowing entry to all forms of post-secondary education after 12 years of schooling. We view a fifth year of secondary education as being educationally unnecessary, and socially, an undesirable barrier to wider accessibility of post-secondary education. Much of the social screening that is now attributed to post-secondary educational institutions occurs, in fact, by grade 9 when the streaming of students starts. By abolishing the 13th year, and without diminishing the quality of education—[notice he says "by abolishing the 13th year and not diminishing the quality"] —we will be increasing the educational opportunities of our students and decreasing the social distance separating the different kinds of post-secondary institutions of the province.

And I end the quote there.

Dr. R. C. Quittenton, the president of St. Clair College, presented a brief to the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario on April 20, 1971. Here is what he says concerning grade 13. I am quoting from his brief:

> In all of North America, grade 13 in Ontario is an anachronism; it should be terminated promptly, and the resources so liberated invested elsewhere in the academic system. Surely we are not so naive as really to believe that an Ontario grade 13 graduate is better educated than a grade 12 graduate from Manitoba or Michigan—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think they are.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Oh, come on.

Mr. B. Newman: I would think, Mr. Minister, he would by far have more informa-

tion than would you after having been involved in the system a little longer than have you, Mr. Minister, so he has been on the receiving end—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, but they have to add an extra year to their university then.

Mr. B. Newman: It does not necessarily add an extra year to the university whatsoever. It doesn't in Manitoba, does it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In fact, they only go to grade 11.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Do they have a three-year arts course in Manitoba?

Mr. Foulds: Or BC.

Mr. B. Newman: I continue from Dr. Quittenton's brief:

> Not when these students enter our university system and graduate schools, and pass through them with no difficulty.

And he refers to grade 12 students who can pass through with no difficulty, that is, the students coming in from Manitoba and the students coming in from Michigan. I continue with his comments:

> But the members of the commission are more aware of this than I am. I bring it up because we can no longer afford to invest academic resources where they are not really needed, as in grade 13, and because we frequently receive maladjusted grade 13 graduates from the high schools.
>
> Youth is maturing earlier, as it is well known. The strain of confining a grade 13 student in the same institution with a grade 9, and treating him essentially the same, as now happens, is merely creating needless social and academic problems in the high schools. We see this very clearly ourselves when we operate the first-year CAAT programme in a high school. It is a failure. So I call upon the commission to start phasing out grade 13 in 1971. This is a luxury we no longer need, nor can afford.

The minister can see that the comments of the president of St. Clair community college in the city of Windsor, made back in 1971—

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, no—

Mr. B. Newman: —hold just as true today. In 1970, there were 51,665 grade 13 students in Ontario. The cost of educating one student per year is $1,251. If we multiply the number of grade 13 students by the cost per student, we can get the cost of educating all grade 13 students in the province; that is, some $64,632,915.

I believe it to be incorrect to say that the province would save $64 million by eliminating grade 13 because administrative and other costs would have to be deducted from the figure that I gave. But certainly Ontario could save a substantial amount of money, and I would guess approximately $50 million a year, by eliminating grade 13.

By the elimination of grade 13, as I have mentioned quite often in the House, I don't mean cutting out grade 13, I mean simply taking the subject content in grade 13 and distributing it over the four years in the school. Thus the individual graduating from grade 13 would have the same level of educational achievement but would have completed his secondary schooling one year earlier. He would be able to get into the work force, if he so wished, one year earlier, and would be accepted into our universities one year younger than he is today, being just as mature as he is today.

In addition to that, this could be a substantial saving to the municipal property taxpayer, who has to pay the burden of grade 13 education.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of equality of educational opportunity is a continuing one. With the advent of the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan in 1964, a progressive erosion of the financial inequality between the public and the separate school has narrowed it. I would like to commend the government for the improvements implemented in the past, but may I also point out that equality has still not been achieved.

Changes in the grant regulations pertaining to the school system must include the overall total revenue per pupil; not simply the total amount provided by means of a grant from the Department of Education, but also the amount that is available to that student from the property taxpayer in the given municipality. It is only by using a total overall revenue grant figure per pupil that a comparison can really be made by public and separate school financial availabilities.

May I point out to the minister that the total revenue per pupil between the two systems still has not balanced off. In 1963 the public school system received $371, the separate school system $260. In 1964 the public went to $386, the separate to $301. In 1965 the public went to $409, the separate to $329.

In 1966 the public went up to $456, the separate to $377. In 1967, the public went up to $484, the separate to $427. In 1968, the public went up to $574, the separate to $506; in 1969, the public to $641, the separate to $577. And in 1970, the last year for which figures were available, the public went up to $719, and the separate went up to $636.

There still is the disparity between the two systems; yet we always come along and say that we should provide equality of educational opportunity. Surely this can't be equality if there is the difference in the revenue available for students between the two systems.

I do not speak for extension of any of the two systems at all; I simply speak for equality between the revenue available per pupil to educate an individual in the public school system as opposed to the separate school system.

Looking at the revenue available per pupil between the two systems: In 1963, the separate system received 70.2 per cent of the public; in 1964, the separate received 78.1 per cent of the public; in 1965, the separate received 80.3 per cent of the public; in 1966, the separate received 82.7 per cent of the public; in 1967, the separate received 88.2 per cent of the public; in 1968, the separate received 88.2 per cent of the public, similar to the previous year; in 1969, the separate received 90 per cent of the public revenue; and in 1970, the separate school pupil revenue was 92.2 per cent of the public school revenue.

The statistics, Mr. Chairman, are really not accurate; simply because the separate school revenues include revenues for grades 9 and 10; whereas the public school revenue stopped at grade 8. So we are comparing the grade 8 revenue of kindergarten to grade 8 when we talk about the public school revenue; but we are comparing kindergarten up to grade 10 when we talk about the separate school revenue.

What we really need, Mr. Minister, is comparable figures provided by the department, so that in estimating the revenue we have comparison of the revenue available to the separate school student in comparison to that of the public school student, up to and including grade 8; not grades 9 and 10.

For example, the separate school average in 1963, up to and including grades 9 and 10, was $636 in 1970; the public revenue was $719. The separate school revenue for grades 9 and 10 is $730 in the year 1970, while the public school revenue is, for grades 9 and 10, $1,251. So you can see there is a substantial difference in the revenue available to the separate school student in comparison to the public school student.

So that both at the elementary and the junior secondary level, there should be improvements in revenue available formula to make sure that there is equality of educational opportunity to both systems. As long as both systems are being recognized by the government, then equality should be available to both systems.

To bring this out a little further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out—and this is frequently pointed out by the government—that the grants given to the separate school system are by far more substantial than those given to the public school system. This is absolutely true. But the revenue available to the separate school system is approximately one-third to one-quarter less than that available to the public school system because of the local taxation setup as it presently exists.

The revenue available in 1970 to the public school pupil was $719; to the separate school pupil $663. The provincial grant available to the public school student was $307; to the separate school student, substantially more, $524. The other revenue, that is local taxes on real estate, to the public school student was $412 in 1970. The $307 and $412 total $719, the revenue available per student in the public school system, whereas the revenue available to a separate school student was $139 from taxation; the province provided $524, making a total of $663. It is easy to see that the revenue available to educate a separate school student is substantially lower—approximately 10 per cent lower—than it is for a public school student.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He seems to be quoting from something. I wonder if he has the source of these figures? Are these his personal figures, or are they figures published in any report?

Mr. B. Newman: No, I am quoting figures presented in a brief, I would assume to the minister, on "Trends in Ontario Separate School Finance" by Carl J. Matthews, SJ. I would assume that this was presented to the minister at some time or other. His officials would have this.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Was it a personal presentation?

Mr. B. Newman: Whether or not it was a personal presentation, I can't say. But if the figures he presents are accurate you can see there is a disparity between the financial assistance to the separate schools and that to the public schools. If we believe in the principle of equality of education—and we are not talking about extension—the equality should be up to the end of the two systems where they are officially recognized by the constitution.

May I go to another topic, and that is the cost of education. Mr. Chairman, may I bring to the attention of the hon. minister a tale of a city. I am going to use the city of Windsor not because I happen to be a resident of it and represent it here but because Windsor's plight is probably typical of that of many other municipalities caught between the province's ultimatum to do certain things and the financial straitjacket they find themselves in as a result of very substantial increases in municipal property taxes. The elimination of the property tax shelter rebate certainly has aggravated the financial plight of the municipality. It has aggravated it to the extent of some $150 million a year.

I use this to point out to the government that the costs to a municipality, including educational costs, are extremely substantial and that the department has to consider seriously assuming a greater burden of municipal educational costs.

Since 1961, to use the tale of a city—the city of Windsor—the per capita debt has doubled from $85 in 1966 to $198 in 1971. A lot of this can be attributed to rising education costs even though the minister may mention that the department has taken over some portion of educational costs.

The portion they have taken over is not sufficient to enable municipalities to carry on programmes which they are being forced to carry on by other levels of government. For example, simply reading headlines from the Windsor Star recently, "Sewer demands put drain on city." "City Asks for Aid to Meet Pollution Abatement Cheque." "OMB Unable to Review E. C. Row Construction." "Council Asks for Financial Aid Again." The burden of the municipal property taxes is at a breaking point. Property taxes are just too high.

Think of the senior citizen on a fixed income. Think of the ordinary homeowner, paying close to $100 more in municipal property taxes this year than last; having his municipal property taxes doubling over not too lengthy a period of time.

In the post-secondary area, 78 per cent of the cost of education is paid for by the province. Why can't this same principle be applied also to the responsibilities of this ministry? The present approach of absorbing a greater share of educational cost is much too slow.

I will continue on that in a short while, Mr. Minister. But I would like, at this time, to bring to your attention an editorial published recently in the Windsor Star which shows how the cost to a city is too high—that the cities just can't cope with the financial squeeze they're in.

This editorial is titled, "Caught in a Squeeze."

> Windsor has the best possible arguments in favour of greater financial aid from the Ontario government. All that the city need do is present these facts to Queen's Park.
>
> The province has given Windsor an 11-point ultimatum requiring a speedup of the city's $40 million sewer programme. Windsor is committeed to paying about one-quarter of the annual cost of building the E. C. Row Expressway over the next decade or more, in addition to keeping connecting streets and roads in repair.
>
> The province has reduced the payments it makes to help municipalities to meet their road budgets, and has refused a request to reduce Windsor's commitment of about $1 million a year for the E. C. Row project. The province has made no provision for helping Windsor to meet the added cost of speeding up the sewer project.
>
> Such powerful and logical arguments, unfortunately, are nothing new at Queen's Park. In similar form, they have come from every large city in the province.
>
> The provincial government seems to have no policy, other than perhaps to ignore requests to deal with them. Yet until some policy emerges and the cities are assured of more help, the province remains in the position of ordering the cities to spend more money and, at the same time, giving them no advice as to where the money is to come from.

I simply read that to emphasize the point I had been making. That is, that the province has to absorb a greater cost of the educational burden.

The minister may say that the province now assumes 60 per cent. That is not high enough. The province must assume at least 80 per cent of the cost of education to enable cities to be operative, to become viable, to be able to provide other services in the community.

The educational tax dollar is too great for the cities to be able to survive at the present level of operation. They will not be able to provide the services—not services that they wish so much, but which are being forced upon them by the provincial government.

The Liberal Party, since 1963, has stated—and still continues to hold the position—that 80 per cent of the cost of education must be borne by the province. No longer can one say that the money spent by a municipality on education benefits that given municipality. The province, as a whole, benefits.

Many, many municipalities have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars educating their youth, only to have them move into larger metro areas, and, if in need of more education, attending colleges and universities in these other areas, with the province picking up 78 per cent of the cost of this post-secondary education.

Mr. Chairman, the elimination of grade 13, as a burden to the municipal property tax payer, could be a substantial saving. It would enable the municipality to use those funds that it would have used for the provision of grade 13 education to provide other services to the municipality.

At the present time, in the city of Quebec, there happens to be a conference of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities and Mayor Desmond Newman, of Whitby, has stated—and I'm quoting from the article in today's Globe—"Mr. Newman said property tax on which municipalities rely has been demonstrated to be the least responsive to economic growth."

Using that alone as a point of argument, Mr. Chairman, that means the municipalities no longer can stand the burdens, one of them being education, and the province is going to have to substantially increase its financial assistance to the municipalities. The Liberal Party maintains, as it has now for some three elections, that 80 per cent of the cost of education should be borne by the province.

Mr. Chairman, I could mention discrimination in the school system, showing that the percentage of women principals is extremely small compared to that of the male and that the number of women holding all types of executive positions in education is not high enough. The department has to look into the greater use of the talents that they possess when it comes to providing promotional opportunities.

Likewise I could make some substantial comments on the textbooks that are used in the school system, showing how the textbooks have a definite relationship to personality development and that a child's behaviour can be adversely affected as the result of the type of textbooks that are used. The textbooks need a little more preparation and review so those that are used in the school system do not adversely affect the student.

I could also make reference to the Ontario Human Rights Commission report on the teaching of prejudice in Ontario schools and ask the minister to look into it. Likewise, when we do get into curriculum development later, I have a series of questions that I will ask of the minister.

I could likewise speak on the utilization of educational facilities, having been on a committee that travelled a bit about the province studying the facilities. The big comment always being made is that the school boards and individuals all agree with the principle of the greater use—a community use—of the school, but the funds and budgetary restrictions prevent them from using the schools to the degree and to the extent to which they would like to have them used.

I could speak extensively on financing public education. However, I am fairly sure that the minister or his department has studied the submission to the committee on the costs of education by the Ontario Teachers Federation and the second report on financing public education in Ontario presented by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think that I have spoken more than I really had intended and I will now allow the critic of the New Democratic Party to speak. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to feel a little—paranoid is too strong a word, but the overflowing benches just dazzle me. I hate to be immodest about this, but it is probably the smallest public meeting I have had in my brief political career.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You are lucky Donald came in.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): There is a lot of quality over there.

Mr. Foulds: Yes. Nevertheless, I would like to lead off, as they say, on the Ministry of Education estimates. I would like to start my remarks on the estimates, Mr. Chairman, by relating a personal anecdote.

While driving home in my car on Monday evening, I heard that CBC news report that Michelangelo's statue, the Pieta, the marvellous statue of Mary holding the dead Christ, had been smashed by a man with a hammer. I have had the privilege of seeing that statue, Mr. Chairman, and it was one of the five or six great aesthetic moments in my life. When I heard that brief news bulletin I felt sick to my stomach. Who would destroy such a rare creation of absolute beauty? The news report went on to the effect that the man responsible could receive up to, I believe, about six years in jail, but first he was going to be put under psychiatric observation.

As I have said, I felt sick when I first heard the news. Then, after a few more miles of driving it occurred to me to wonder, "Why are you so upset?" Yes, it is true that the Pieta is a work of incomparable beauty. Yes, a certain creative genius found his expression in that marvellous marble statue. Yes, that statue is irreplaceable. Even though the Vatican had once valued it and insured it for $10 million, it had been generally admitted that that kind of work knew no monetary limits in value.

However, another train of thought was going on in my mind at the same time. All last weekend, and indeed for several weeks now, my subconscious and a good deal of my conscious time has been spent pondering the enormity of the estimates of the Ministry of Education. That night after that news broadcast something clicked into place for me. After driving along for another five minutes or so in shocked silence I again asked myself, "Why are you so upset? Isn't it mainly because of the dramatic quality of the event? It is, of course, because of the senseless destruction of that unique work but, after all," I reflected to myself to my chagrin, "doesn't that happen every day?"

Then, Mr. Chairman, it really hit home to me, in some ways isn't that what our educational system does? Doesn't it maim or cripple or damage or destroy unique, creative, human beings every day almost as a matter of ongoing process? I am not unduly anarchistic about our school system. I sometimes think, it is true, that we should scrap the whole thing and start all over again.

I sometimes think also that whoever is responsible—and I believe that we are all responsible; parents, teachers, students, legislators, administrators, politicians and taxpayers—for our school system should, like that unfortunate man who smashed the Pieta of Michelangelo over the weekend, perhaps occasionally, too, be put under psychiatric observation. Because through our educational system are we not sometimes so warping and so destroying creativity in a way and so often that it has become bearable? In William Faulkner's phrase about another matter, "We have learned to live with it."

It is my task during the course of discussing these most vital expenditures to try to make those of us in this House and those in the Department of Education live with it a little less happily, a little less comfortably. I do not intend to be unduly negative, Mr. Chairman, because I firmly believe that there is not one person connected with the educational system in this province who deliberately contributes to the destruction of human creativity.

I know that every person that I have met connected with education over the last 15 years, and I have had a good deal of personal contact with educators of various types and in various situations, who wanted, and in some cases wanted desperately, to develop human creativity, the latent talents of all our people, of all our students.

I believe, funnily enough, that that is true of even the most hidebound administrator. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I think the intention of the Department of Education officials, the local school trustees, the local administrative authorities, the principals, the teachers and even the caretaking staffs is a good, progressive, benevolent one. They all, we all, want an education system to liberate the various individual talents of our children.

We, also, I think, perceive the system as one which would result in a common or collective good as well. But until each and every student in our society reaches his or her full potential, we cannot be satisfied. While the system is still, for whatever reasons, positively harming some children, we must be positively alarmed. So, while I do not doubt the sincerity of those connected with education, I'm afraid I have at times very grave reservations about their wisdom. I think that in many cases they are the prisoners of an educational monster that is now running them. To use a time-worn cliché, they can't see the forest for the trees.

As these foregoing remarks indicate, Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to engage in dialogue with the minister about the philosophy of education.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): No way.

Mr. Foulds: You see I do not think that philosophy is an abstract or esoteric term. You need to have a clear philosophy of education to make the kinds of decisions that are facing all of us at this time in education. I would submit that one of the reasons that education is in such confusion in this province, and not only in this province but in the country and in this continent today, is simply that there is no clear philosophy of what we are doing and why we are doing it. Basically, there is no clear philosophy of why we are spending the money that we do.

I think it is safe to say that our system has only sluggishly responded or reacted to certain events. For example, the emphasis on science and technology in the late Fifties was in response to sputnik. The enormous building programmes of the Sixties were in response to the increasing number of students, because of the population explosion and because of the decreasing job opportunities on the economic market. Finally, the present ceilings on educational spending are a reaction to a kind of Archie Bunker mentality which does not understand why we spend money on education and which is crying out against what appear to be excessive costs.

All these things, therefore, Mr. Chairman, are reactions to events. None of them anticipates our educational needs. I suspect that all the talk about flexibility and choice and relevance in the educational system is simply a kind of jargon, a kind of public relations talk to try to put the best face on a system that is slowly but surely crashing down a cataract of confusion.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You don't really believe that.

Mr. Lewis: It is pretty clear from the system.

Mr. Foulds: I certainly do.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You don't really believe that.

Mr. Foulds: You just wait and find out.

Mr. Martel: Our holding tank policy.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He must have Walter Pitman write his speeches.

Mr. Foulds: That is a palpable slander.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Walter Pitman wouldn't like you to say that.

Mr. Foulds: It would be as improper for me to accuse the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch) of writing the minister's speech.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is an interesting reflection on the minister's approach to speeches.

Mr. Foulds: Don't start getting personal. I have tried deliberately to stay away from that. But I can engage in that kind of exchange, if you want to.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You know this great calamity talk is just a lot of nonsense.

Mr. Foulds: Just you prove it. You are going to have to prove it over the next six days.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I want you to prove it.

Mr. Foulds: Just wait—

Mr. Chairman: Order, the member for Port Arthur has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You just prove it.

Mr. Martel: The minister is being provocative.

Mr. Foulds: There seems to be very little planning in the field of education in Ontario. As one commentator has put it, "We are speeding into the future with our eyes firmly fixed on the rear-view mirror." That seems to me to be fairly accurate and to be a matter about which we all should be concerned. So, I come to some fundamental and concrete questions: What is the Ontario educational system designed to do? Why is there such widespread dissatisfaction on the part of teachers, parents, students, taxpayers?

How do we reconcile the needs and aspirations of the various segments of our society who make demands on the educational system? Why is it that the people from the lower social and economic classes still do not find themselves at the university level? Why is it that students who come from homes, which are sometimes called culturally deprived, are steered deliberately sometimes, or inadvertently, or choose to such a large extent programmes that do not wind up at the university level, programmes that we used to call the four-year programmes?

Why do the people and the students from the lower socio-economic classes take these programmes out of all proportion to their proportion of the population? Conversely, why is it that the students from the middle

and higher income families are represented out of all proportion to their numbers in the five-year programmes that result in university education and training?

I would like to move directly now to one topic that is of concern to everyone concerned with education today, that is, the topic of ceilings on spending imposed by the Department of Education. I know that the minister and his officials are very sensitive about the use of the term cutbacks in spending so I will try to refrain from the use of that term and stick to the term ceilings. However, that may be difficult. I will at least try.

The limitation on educational spending was undoubtedly necessary and undoubtedly politically wise and I would like to underline that word politically wise. I think the decision was a deliberately political one, and that is using the word political in the worst sense. I believe that this government has responded in a most artificial way to the rising costs of education.

It simply said that each board would be allowed to spend so much per student. The government called these guidelines. As I have said on a previous occasion in this House, the government merely lopped the top of the budget by forcing restraints on the local boards of education and managed to contain expenditure; but it did not force either itself or the boards really to look at local priorities or provincial priorities. It may do so. This system may do so in four or five years, time but, in the meantime, a rather artificial and easy way out has been adopted. Courses that have not had time to develop, the courses that are experimental in nature, will suffer and are being cut back.

No genuine attempt on a province-wide basis has been made to look at priorities in spending in education. No province-wide attempt has been made to cut whatever unnecessary cost there was in educational spending, to cut it vertically from the budget of the Department of Education or the boards of education. I give you as one example that it still seems to me quite ridiculous that the director of the Toronto Board of Education should have a chauffeur-driven limousine.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh, but he doesn't. He doesn't.

Mr. Foulds: By the way, it also seems to me quite ridiculous that the Premier (Mr. Davis) should have a chauffeur-driven limousine.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Check that out with the Toronto Board of Education.

Mr. Foulds: But they struck it out, right in the crunch. When it really came down to it, they struck it out. But those kind of expenses and the way the government tackled the problem leads the budgeting process to stop so that no one area suffers. That is the excuse they use, that everyone is harmed equally. It tends to be administrative expenditures that are maintained because it is the administrators who have the largest input into what things are cut.

I am reminded of that beautifully ironic and satiric phrase that one of the better educational television programmes used: "No expense has been spared to keep costs down to a minimum." But where have those costs been kept down to a minimum and where has the expense not been spared? Those are the fundamental questions that are facing us.

I am afraid that the expense that has not been spared is in some areas, not only financial but it also affects the quality of education. The minister has, and the Premier has, during many a question period insisted that the quality of education will not suffer because of the ceilings. In fact, on one occasion the minister challenged those of us on this side of the House to give him just one example of a course that had been cut back because of the educational ceiling.

I do not wish to try the patience of the House with the long list that I have accumulated since that day; the enrichment classes for slow learners; language options in all secondary and elementary levels; library services; guidance and counselling services; programmes for gifted children. But I do want to give two precise examples that illustrate what I think pinpoints the two opposite poles of what suffers when limitations on spending are imposed in the artificial way that the government has done.

My main argument is basically this: The boards have not responded in the way that the minister said that they have responded in his opening statement.

The first example: East York Collegiate, Toronto; 35 students applied for grade 10 Latin classes. They cannot take it. It is not being offered even though there is a highly qualified teacher to do it. Those students who want to take Latin from the area served by East York Collegiate will have to go to Leaside; yet 35 is more than enough for a viable class. Not only that, but in that school the senior class of Latin will combine grade 12 and grade 13 students.

The minister and his officials cannot blithely tell me that in spite of the heroic efforts of that particular teacher, in spite of the interest of those particular students, that the quality of education in that course will not suffer. Anyone who is at all aware of the classics curriculum in this province knows that the quantum leap between grade 12 and grade 13 in Latin is quite great. Combining the classes into one economically viable unit will harm both those taking what should be grade 12 Latin and those that should be taking the more advanced grade 13 Latin.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that it is not popular in this philistine age of so-called relevance to take up the cudgels on behalf of courses such as Latin. But I do want to say that if 35 children in the school system want to take a subject of such traditional importance as Latin, then they should have the right to take it at the school to which they would naturally and normally go.

I want to go further. If our system has become the victim of relevance to such a degree that one of the few subjects that tests the agility of the mind, that imbues a sense of history and civilization is callously and casually tossed aside as of little importance, then our educational system and our society are in much worse shape than any of us has imagined. I would argue that there is a place for the traditional and the conservative cast of mind in our school system in intellectual terms, if not in political terms. To downgrade such a subject as Latin is to deny it a legitimate and valuable pursuit in our educational system; and we will be the poorer for it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: What is that?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Do you want to put it on the record?

Mr. Foulds: The other example is perhaps at the other end of the spectrum, but equally if not more important. The minister is in receipt of a letter of April 24, 1972, from Mr. E. R. Freeborne, business administrator of the Chapleau Board of Education.

Dear Mr. Minister:

The chairman and the trustees of the Chapleau Board of Education have instructed me to advise you that as a result of spending ceilings and ordinary expenditures imposed by the Ontario Department of Education in 1972-1973, the board has had to decide on a cutback in operation to keep within the ceilings.

The class for the trainable retarded established only in January 1971 for some of the retarded children will have to be discontinued in September 1972 because the board is unable to continue operating this class to keep the ordinary expenditure ceiling.

In addition to this, the staff of the school has been reduced by one teacher placing a heavier work load on the already heavy schedule of the school. The position of library technician at the high school is being terminated effective September, 1972.

A close assessment of the occupations programme at the school will be made in early 1973, and it is quite possible the conditions will warrant discontinuing this programme effective 1973.

This matter is being brought to your attention at this time so that you will be aware of the impact that spending ceilings have had on a small northern Ontario board who have had no frills in their operation at any time.

In September 1972 we will have seven very dissatisfied parents when we have nothing to offer the trainable retarded children and 20 to 30 children will be involved if it is necessary to discontinue the diversified occupations programme in September 1973.

Now, Mr. Minister, I know that your department has responded. I know that the regional officials have been up there and that that class for trainable retarded children will be continued at the Chapleau school. But what about the boards; the small north Ontario boards—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, could I ask the hon. member—

Mr. Foulds: I am not going to yield the floor until I finish the paragraph.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If you're going to read one letter from that fellow why don't you read his letter of May 16?

Mr. Foulds: You can read that when you get your chance to reply. But what about the boards—the small northern Ontario boards—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I hope you are more accurate than you were about Ron Jones.

Mr. Foulds: —which don't have the know-how or the commitment, or the guts to make an issue out of it? There would have been

quietly, without a murmur, a tragic loss to the quality of education in one small corner of this province. We don't know how many of these are going on right at this moment.

Okay, Mr. Minister. You can have your turn if you wish.

Hon. Mr. Wells: All I ask, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. member, if he is going to read letters, read the letter of May 16.

Mr. MacDonald: How many other boards have the same situation?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): And have not had the guts to complain.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the key issue.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Port Arthur has the floor.

Mr. Foulds: I use the point as an illustration. That board had the guts to fight it. They got support. I am pleased about that.

Will you please not continually interrupt, and deliberately misinterpret me? You are only getting yourself into more trouble.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I hope you are more accurate than you were about Ron Jones.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Ron Jones doesn't have a car now.

Mr. Foulds: If any place in this province is dropping a course such as that, because of lack of expertise on the part of the small board, isn't the system the poorer? Isn't our society the poorer, because a northern community such as Chapleau, first of all, did have a class for trainable retarded children endangered, and it must terminate some other services.

If the minister attempts to gloss over these cases, if the people of this province merely feel, "It doesn't affect me directly. It can't happen where I am. My kids will still get an education," then our education system is not an education system at all. As I have said before on another occasion with the minister and the deputy minister, it is merely a holding operation to keep children off the work market.

I am reminded of an excerpt from one of John Donne's famous sermons: "Never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee." If we allow this kind of serious impairment—

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Amen.

Mr. Foulds: Does the member for Oshawa want me to send him a copy of the sermon? It might do him some good.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: If we allow this kind of serious impairment to the quality of education in any part of our educational system, the whole system suffers, and it becomes a mockery that we preach and talk about the quality of education. It becomes a mockery that the minister, in his opening statement, talks about teacher involvement and developing curriculum. I have had a good deal of involvement in curriculum development as a department head in the high school. I have worked closely with many of my teachers in developing programmes in English, theatre arts, remedial reading. These programmes do not develop overnight. Even with the department's guidelines—and it is a healthy thing, that the department is offering only guidelines, and allowing the teachers the flexibility to develop curriculum to suit the special needs of their areas, and their students—the teachers need the time to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I once worked on a committee of five teachers that developed one of the first courses in this province called, "Man and Society." There were five of us, and we worked on it for one full year before we offered the course—two nights a week for three hours at a stretch, to develop that curriculum. When we instituted it, I dare say it was a pretty fair course. But stop to think of it. Let's say that we met during the course of that full year, not every week, not 52 weeks in the year, although we did meet during the summer break, but there were five of us meeting for six hours a week, let's say, for 30 weeks, about half the year. That's 30 times six, times five; that's 900 manhours put into developing one course of study.

Now that was an unusual course, Mr. Chairman. That was a course that, immodest as it may sound, I consider was truly innovative at the time. We had no firm guidelines but we had the permission of the department. It was a course that was designed for 30 students. You cannot tell me that with the increase in the pupil-teacher ratio, with the increase in the number of periods per week most teachers will have to work, that they are going to have the time, the energy, or the interest to develop the curriculum that the minister talked about so glibly in his opening statement.

I personally think that the teachers of North York who held that famous study

session which was labelled a strike have been unduly condemned. I think they should have been given some very serious consideration because for once their interest was not in their wages, but it was an interest, and I think a genuine interest, in keeping quality for their students and in keeping working conditions for themselves. It was the first time that the teachers of this province opted to do something directly for their students in a public way.

It seems to me unfortunate that they were damned up and down in the press, by editorial writers, by certain trustees and by the silence of the minister.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I wasn't silent.

Mr. Lewis: No, you condemned them too.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I said—

Mr. Foulds: Yes, after four days.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I said—

Mr. Foulds: Right. After I had pinned you down on it in the House. And that leads me to the next aspect of my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member hasn't stated his position until right now.

Mr. Foulds: That is the problem—

Mr. MacDonald: The member is obviously getting to the minister.

Mr. Foulds: I'll get to my position. That is the problem that you get into when you get into a system in education financing which is essentially formula financing. That is what we are beginning to get into in the elementary and secondary levels of education, just as we had previously got into formula financing at the universities. And the weaknesses that have shown up in the university system should be taken as a lesson or as a caution by those concerned with the secondary and elementary systems. I really hope you understand me here, Mr. Minister. I am not holus-bolus condemning the system; I think there are certain cautions that we need to take and to examine it very carefully.

I did not really have the the pleasure of having the presence of the minister in the House during my remarks made in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, and now that he is here, and his department officials, I would like to reiterate some of those remarks to get a starting point for what I want to develop in the rest of my remarks today.

I said, at that time, that the method of imposition of ceilings on educational spending did not attack the essential problem, and that what happens with a formula based on numbers of students is that those courses which have just recently been developed, and are beginning to prove their worth, are the ones that unfortunately get cut back first. The more entrenched courses, with large enrolments, are the ones that, by and large, remain. It seems to me that out society and our educational system must recognize that individuals need to develop their whole personality; that they are not mere receptacles into which knowledge and information are to be poured; that they are living, creative beings.

The major fault with the present educational spending ceilings, is that they do not fundamentally realign spending. They merely curtail. They may, as I said, slice off the top of the educational budgets but they do not get at the vertical fat within those budgets. I think the most fundamental thing is that where we need to put more of our educational budget is at the elementary and the pre-elementary levels. I daresay that for every dollar that we are presumably saving at the elementary level through our educational ceilings, it costs us twice as much at the secondary level and three times as much as the post-secondary level, to remedy the problems we created by our so-called savings at the elementary and pre-school levels.

What we need is a fundamental realignment of education spending so that we can get value for our money. I suggest that we would not only get more return on our investment in economic terms by spending more money at the elementary and pre-school levels, and relatively less at the secondary and post-secondary levels, but that we would be serving the cause of social and economic justice as well by doing so.

We in this party believe that equality of opportunity in education is a top priority. It begins very early in a child's life. The equality of opportunity in education for the socially and economically handicapped of this province is a right. We do not feel that those people, who through an accident of birth are disadvantaged, be that handicap emotional, mental, physical, social or economic, should be second-class citizens. We feel that it is our responsibility, and society's responsibility, to ensure their fullest possible development as human beings. We do not

consider this a frill; we consider it an essential. Rather than impose the artificial limits on spending that result in the elimination of programmes which the disadvantaged of our society need, we in this party would redesign, realign and redirect our spending from the bricks and mortar—as this government is beginning to do, admittedly—and put the money where it belongs, on the children not on the bureaucracy.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to have these remarks that I have made before in this House kept in mind as I begin to talk now a little bit more about the present limits or ceilings on education spending in this province.

At the present time, I believe the limits are $595 for an elementary school pupil; $1,100 for a secondary school pupil; and that the basic income unit received by the CAAT and universities is $1,765 for each student. Is that basically correct?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The first two are.

Mr. Foulds: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The first two are.

Mr. Foulds: The first two are. Fine. I checked in the estimates of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities for the third.

I want to explain in the simplest possible terms what I meant when I spoke earlier about a realignment and redirection of spending. I would like the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities to begin the process of reversing these figures, these ratios. I know it can't be done overnight but I would like to see, if we are going to have formula financing at all, more money directed to the elementary school student, proportionately less to the secondary school student and less to the university student.

In other words, I can see no reason why we should be spending, on an elementary school student, one-third of what we spend on a university student or one-half of what we spend on a secondary school student.

Mr. Martel: That's where the teaching is.

Mr. Foulds: What is the rationale behind this imbalance? Has anybody connected with Ontario's educational system stopped to think why we are spending twice as much for secondary school students as we do for elementary school students? Oh, I know all the mechanistic answers. I know that the technical equipment costs more; that the desks are bigger; that the football equipment costs more; textbooks cost more and so on and so on. But no one really seems to have fundamentally considered the question why? Why is it more acceptable to us as a society to spend twice as much on a secondary school student as on a primary student? Why is it more acceptable to spend three times as much on a university student as on a primary student?

I would suspect that if the public were fully aware of these proportions and of their implications they would very much want to see these trends reversed. Certainly those people who come from the lower socio-economic groups would rather see money spent on their children who often, because the pupil-teacher ratio is too high or because there isn't money to provide the diagnostic services and the enrichment services necessary, never reach university. If there was—pardon me, I got my tense wrong—if there were—subjunctive there, you know—

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): In view of his previous portfolio the minister should know that.

Mr. Foulds: If there were a genuine realignment of spending, as I am suggesting, one helluva lot more children from disadvantaged homes would reach university. We would begin to begin to reverse the pernicious tendency of today in which the lower socio-economic groups substantially subsidize the education of the middle- and the high-income students at the post-secondary level.

There are a couple of other points about the impositions of ceilings on spending that I would like to talk about. It is, as we have seen, a form of formula financing. We have seen at the university level that formula financing works fairly well as long as there is an expanding enrolment. But as soon as the enrolment begins to drop off or decline, as it has begun to do at the university level, the individual institutions suffer because they have developed systems that need expansion. They cannot cut back without withdrawing services. In other words—

Mr. Laughren: A capitalist system.

Mr. Foulds: Exactly. In other words the formula financing system requires an optimum figure of enrolment that is always larger than the previous year's enrolment. The formula system does not encourage the formulation of a true optimum figure. And I believe that the

statistics indicate at the present time a declining enrolment beginning in the primary grades of elementary school.

With the lowest amount per pupil allotted to this sector of education, with the declining enrolments in this sector of education, this area of education is going to suffer. There are going to be cutbacks.

There is another aspect of the budgetary ceilings that I find extremely worrisome. There is a general philosophy inherent in the process of formula budgets which is a major reason why the present government endorses this approach.

With the formula budgeting you don't have to worry about priorities. You don't have to worry about new ideas. You don't have to worry about the philosophy of education. You don't have to worry about what is important or essential. You simply maintain the status quo. You tend to cut all present areas equally in percentage terms, so that while an administrator cuts five per cent of some of his office supplies, the teacher in Cabbagetown has his class increased by two or three students.

Mr. Martel: Very helpful to the students.

Mr. Foulds: You see, what happens administratively is simple. Everyone suffers equally. There are no troublesome philosophic questions about whether the school system might be better served if the administrator didn't get a new carpet in his board room, and if the pupil-teacher ratio was kept down in Cabbagetown.

I would like to support this contention that formula budgeting reinforces the status quo by quoting from a letter from W. J. McCordic, director and secretary-treasurer of the Toronto Metro Board, to the directors of education, concerning guidelines for the preparation of the 1972 current operating budgets of the area boards of education and the metropolitan school boards; dated Sept. 29, 1971. And this was the approach that was first used and thought of and ultimately, in one way or another, followed through:

> It would be unreasonable to anticipate that the school boards in Metro will be permitted by the provincial ceilings to expand services or implement new ones.

I would just like to underline the point by repeating that phrase:

> It would be unreasonable to anticipate that school boards in Metro will be permitted by the provincial ceiling to expand services or implement new ones.

And in fact Metro officials directed that formula budgets be based on the 1971 status quo. Thus the formula budget of an area board included status quo calculations on the six formula areas of the budget, plus status quo amounts for the three non-formula areas.

It is interesting to note that of three items the minister excluded from the ceilings and reclassified as extraordinary expenditures for the Metro school board, there are two about which we would have no quarrel. But one was that 75 per cent of the Metro school boards' administrative costs were reclassified as extraordinary expenditures and thus excluded from the minister's ceilings. Finally, the last danger of the ceiling limitations is that the budgetary process has changed from a bottom-up process to a top-down process.

Mr. Laughren: Not retarded kids at Chapleau

Mr. Foulds: I can remember from my own experience that the budgeting process went something like this.

Teachers and department heads would strike a budget that they felt was needed in their areas. This would be submitted to the principal sometime in November of the year previous to the one for which it was budgeted

The principal would then consult with the department head concerned. It would be put together with the budgets of the other areas or departments of the school.

The department heads and principal would look over the combined school budgets and readjust any obvious overspending or inequalities. This would then be submitted to the board officials, who would look at each school's budget in comparison to the other schools in the system. A similar process would take place at that level, and so on.

All that has basically changed. The Ministry of Education decrees how much can be spent per pupil, all down the line. Local boards, schools and departments have to fall into line. There is no meaningful participation in the formulation of budgets at any kind of grassroots level any more.

Is it any wonder that fewer people are willing to serve as school trustees; that turnouts for elections of trustees are low? People realize subconsciously that the decision-making process in any meaningful sense has been taken away from them. You simply cannot tie their hands financially in this arbitrary way and still prate about local autonomy.

For example, as severe limitations have been placed upon the budgetary process of the metropolitan school board the local autonomy of the Toronto school board with respect to its budget has been eroded. The Toronto board not only reacts to the departmental regulations but also to the decisions of the Metro school board.

This is one of the points: You cannot make policy without having some decision over the budgetary aspect of the operation. Without much policy-making leeway with regard to budgeting, the Toronto trustees, for example, exist in a political vacuum. This vacuum, I would suggest, has been filled by the administrative officials, and I will document that step by step when we come to discuss vote 2203, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to move on to a close examination of the minister's opening statement. I must compliment the minister for having the courage to make such a statement and genuinely thank him for taking the time and the trouble to make a detailed statement of his view of education in Ontario in the 1970s in first presenting his estimates to this House for scrutiny. He is one of the few ministers who had the courtesy and took the time and trouble to go into as much detail as he did.

I would like to examine that statement if I might. On page 2 of that statement the minister says with regard to the budgetary ceilings:

> However, once things settled down and 1972 school budgets were finally set, it quickly became clear that none of the talk about drastic staff cuts or large increases in class size had materialized, nor had the speculation that the quality of education would deteriorate in Ontario schools.

I would like to suggest, first of all, that one of the reasons the talk about the large increases in class size and drastic staff cuts has declined, and the speculation that the quality of education would deteriorate in Ontario has declined, is simply out of resignation on the part of many of those concerned.

I would like the minister to reconcile his statements with what we know initially happened in the Metro school area. We know that different sample budget cuts were developed by the Toronto Metro staff, and after judging the usefulness of the various samples the Metro finance committee chose what was called sample 4.

The budget cuts in sample 4 were formulated on the basis of a five per cent reduction to all but two budget categories. In sample 4 plant maintenance was cut by 17 per cent in the elementary school level and 20 per cent at the secondary level. That is going to catch up to you at some time or another. At this stage of the deliberations, which was admittedly in February, the exact 1972 pupil-teacher ratio had not been fixed. In the absence of this decision—the administrators again—the council of education directors assumed, for whatever reason we do not know, cuts in staff allocation funds roughly greater than an increase of one in the pupil-teacher ratio. The sample was to be put through a trial run by the area boards to determine the effects of the 1972 ceilings.

For the Toronto board of education sample 4 proposed cuts of $3,359,626. In the elementary panel, the proposed cut was that; and in the secondary panel the proposed cut was $2,765,831. Then the senior staff committee and the director undertook to establish the effect of these cuts on the board's operation at a special budget meeting on Feb. 29. And the director reported the impact of these cuts.

Especially significant cuts were noted in staff allocation; 246 teaching positions would be eliminated in the elementary panel and 342 positions in the secondary panel.

Now, I know these were projections of February and that certain adjustments have taken place since then. But I would like to know, quite specifically, how many are the actual reductions, Mr. Minister? Could you, and would you, table that information for us?

I'd like to reinforce this statistical argument regarding the Metro Toronto board, with an anecdotal one that I have concerning the school I was teaching at in Thunder Bay. I know from first-hand information that the principal of Sir Winston Churchill High School in Thunder Bay has indicated to the staff that approximately five teaching positions on a staff of 70 will be eliminated.

Well, by one of those little ironies of life that sometimes occur, one of the positions being eliminated is the very one that I held up until the events of last October. Compounding the irony—I told you we'd get to my position Mr. Minister—compounding that irony is that the person holding that position presently was my Liberal opponent in the last provincial election. And that woman

has considerable talent and energy; a woman who has a good deal to contribute to the education system of this province; a woman of great merit and integrity. But, alas, a woman who will be joining the ranks of the unemployed because she is the junior member of the staff—

An hon. member: Her abilities are relevant—

Mr. Foulds: The implication is obvious. If she's so good—but she really is a first-rate teacher. Actually, I admit she would have been an asset to the Liberal caucus! They need her very badly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: You see, Mr. Chairman, my interest is not a partisan political one. It is one genuinely in the quality of education. One of the things that went through the minister's speech was the minister's use of the phrase "quality of education," over and over again, almost as an incantation. He was convinced that if he said it often enough, it would not slip away.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: He is convinced that if he says the word "quality" often enough, it will not slip away, as it is surely doing; like a man who holds water cupped in his hands and gently spreads his fingers wide. That water is lost, never again to be recovered, and that, I'm afraid, is what's happening to the quality of education in this province. Come September—

Mr. Laughren: Watered down.

Mr. Foulds: —we will know more clearly, because even up to now, until the end of this month, May 31, there are roughly two or three, to six to seven, depending on the size of the staff—with that many teachers in almost every school in this province, unsure of whether or not they will be teaching next September until all the option sheets are in.

And so, while the colleges of education are continuing to turn out many, many graduates for whom there are no jobs, here we have an opportunity to begin genuinely to treat people in our monolithic school structure as individuals by reducing the pupil-teacher ratio and seeking economies in other areas; and we are not doing it.

To get back to the minister's statement, on page 3 he says, and I'm quoting again directly:

> Despite some isolated vocal evidence to the contrary, most school board trustees and administrators privately, and often publicly, acknowledge the need for constraints on educational spending. And it is generally agreed among educators and education officials that we can't keep up with the accelerating rate of spending—first, because public financial resources can't keep up with this and also because unlimited spending isn't needed to maintain or improve the quality of education.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Foulds: Right, most of us agree. But that limited spending must be redirected and reorganized as I indicated earlier. It may not necessarily be needed to improve the quality of education, but we will have to find out how we can do that and we cannot do it unless we redirect the money.

Also, it is interesting to note that the minister's emphasis is on the trustees and the administrators. Has the department done a survey of the teachers, or of the students, or of the parents across this province? Will the department have the guts to conduct such a survey, say in the spring of next year, to find out if those people who I have just mentioned feel the quality has been impaired? At that point the minister may be able to make his case. He cannot do it at this point.

At page 7 of his statement, the minister quotes Mr. Preistner of the Halton school board as an example of how spending limits imposed by the province have not harmed the quality of education in Halton county.

I would like to point out to the minister that that is one example. There happen to be, according to the 1970 report of the Minister of Education, 186 boards of education of different types in this province. I would suggest to the minister that this one example is not sufficient to prove his case. It is an illustration of one example; that is all. The percentage of your evidence thus far is not very good, Mr. Minister.

One page 9, the minister again quotes from a speech by Mr. Preistner of the Halton County School Board and uses this quotation as an example—and I quote again directly from Mr. Preistner's statement: "This year's budget does not curtail any existing programmes, and as an example allows more money for field trips."

This statement can be interpreted to make the point that I have made earlier—"does not curtail any existing programmes"—in other

words, the status quo is maintained—"and as an example allows more money for field trips." Now, is that the only area in which the board was able to extend its services?

Mr. Preistner doesn't, in the quotation the minister has given us, indicate any new developing programmes in that school board. There may be some, but the minister has not indicated them to us.

Mr. Lewis: Extraordinary reliance on one man.

Mr. Foulds: On page 9 the—

Mr. Lewis: Who is Preistner?

An hon. member: A little order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: Who is this high Preistner?

Mr. MacDonald: Is he the president of the local Conservative association?

Mr. Foulds: On page 9 the minister says and I quote directly: "There is evidence all over the province that convinces me we are on the verge of a visible move forward toward a greater emphasis on the quality of education."

What is the evidence, Mr. Minister? It is going to take more than a few empty phrases. We would like on this side of the House concrete evidence that there is "a visible move forward toward a greater emphasis on the quality of education."

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the hon. member is—

Mr. Foulds: I hope that is true. I hope the—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. Foulds: —emphasis isn't merely on the repeating of the word "quality, quality, quality."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I am not sure, is the hon. member finished or just—

Some hon. members: No, no.

Mr. Chairman: He is not finished? We will have to rise now to be able to close at 1 o'clock.

Mr. Lewis: This is merely the preface of the talk.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I think the two of you should stay here over the weekend, and get it off your chest.

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Not much progress—progress to the rear.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Before moving the adjournment of the House I would suggest that on Monday, according to the House leader, we will be dealing with Bill 105.

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

(see page 2850)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

1. *Mr. Shulman*—Inquiry of the ministry: What volume of alcoholic beverages of all types, in both dollar and gallon-terms, was sold from April 1, 1969 to March 31, 1970, in the following towns: Nakina, Armstrong, Sioux Lookout (and one other similarly sized southern Ontario community, for comparison)? A maximum statistical breakdown would be appreciated.

Answer by the Solicitor General:

	Beer	*Spirits and Wine*	*Total*
Sioux Lookout			
Gallons	175,200	20,219	195,419
Value	$390,700	$477,257	$867,957
Nakina			
Gallons	13,669	4,365	18,034
Value	$ 37,969	$ 80,186	$118,155
Armstrong			
Gallons	16,794	1,235	18,029
Value	$ 49,073	$ 41,619	$ 90,692
Southern Communities			
Kemptville			
Gallons	114,300	17,568	131,868
Value	$267,000	$501,207	$768,207
St. Isidore de Prescott			
Gallons	18,792	2,992	21,784
Value	$52,202	$ 86,466	$138,668
Pelee Island			
Gallons	13,487	1,735	15,222
Value	$ 37,464	$ 64,458	$101,922

2. *Mr. Martel*—Inquiry of the ministry: Who are the members of the Medical Advisory Board under the Family Benefits Act and what salaries are they paid? 2. How many applications for family benefits allowance, because of disability, were made to the Department of Social and Family Services during the fiscal years 1969-1970 and 1970-1971? 3. How many were refused? 4. How many of the refusals were appealed to the board of review? 5. How many were approved on appeal? 6. How does the board arrive at a decision as to who is disabled and who is unemployable but not disabled?

Answer by the Minister of Community and Social Services:

1. The members of the Medical Advisory Board and their respective salaries are as follows:

Dr. C. W. J. Morris, chairman $21,837 per annum
Dr. A. Cummings, on annual contract at the rate of $17,271
One vacancy.

2 and 3. The number of applications received and their disposition is as follows:

	1969-1970	*1970-1971*
Number of applications	6,820	6,918
Applications granted	3,687	4,168
Ineligible applications	3,133	2,750

4 and 5. An analysis of requests for hearings by the board of review reveals the following:

	1969-1970	*1970-1971*
Number of requests for hearings	43	150
Hearings held	17	135
Hearings not held (points raised resolved)	26	15

	1969-1970	1970-1971
Decisions affirmed	11	65
Decisions affirmed with further medical evidence suggested[1]	3	35
Recommended for order in council[2]	3	35
Total	17	135

[1]These applicants were subsequently granted allowances, following review of further medical evidence.
[2]These applicants were subsequently granted an allowance under Section 8 of The Family Benefits Act.

The regulations of the Family Benefits Act describe a permanently unemployable person as a person who is the head of a family and "unable to engage in remunerative employment for a prolonged period of time as verified by objective medical findings accepted by the medical advisory board."

The decision regarding unemployability depends largely on the medical report completed by the family physician. If it is the opinion of the physician that the man is unemployable and if the objective evidence supporting the opinion is contained in the report, the applicant is certified as unemployable. A review is made at a period of nine months to two years at which time a further report is requested.

The regulations specify that a disabled person is "a person who has a major physical or mental impairment that is likely to continue for a prolonged period of time and who, as a result thereof, is severely limited in activities pertaining to normal living, as verified by objective medical findings accepted by the medical advisory board."

In the matter of disability, the medical report and also the field worker's report are used to determine the nature and extent of the physical or mental impairment. Further information, including hospital reports and specialist's reports may be requested.

If the impairment is such that it is severely limiting the individual in his or her activities pertaining to normal living such as self-care, communication or motor activities, and is likely to continue for an indefinite and prolonged period of time, the individual is certified as disabled.

3. *Mr. Martel*—Inquiry of the ministry: 1. What was the amount paid in by teachers to the Teachers' Superannuation Commission year by year since 1917? 2. What was the government's matching contribution to the Teachers' Superannuation Commission? 3. What was the amount paid out to teachers year by year by the Superannuation Commission since 1917? 4. What portion of #3 was unearned by the teachers receiving benefits from the Teachers' Superannuation Commission?

Answer by the Minister of Education:

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION COMMISSION

Year ended Oct. 31	*Teachers' Contributions*	*Government Contribution*	*Interest from Province*	*Payment to Teachers*
1918	$253,000	$253,000	not known	$ 23,000
1919	274,000	274,000	$ 44,258	67,000
1920	349,000	349,000	73,532	94,000
1921	439,000	439,000	not known	126,000
1922	526,000	526,000	215,588	147,000
1923	544,000	544,000	not known	184,000
1924	563,000	563,000	not known	222,000
1925	622,000	622,000	398,923	377,000
1926	607,000	607,000	463,089	418,000
1927	640,000	640,000	524,763	467,000
1928	668,000	668,000	586,956	524,000
1929	691,000	691,000	654,681	551,000
1930	723,000	723,000	733,000	596,000
1931	805,139	805,139	777,630	524,352
1932	718,629	719,241	863,458	723,832
1933	739,898	739,898	877,702	834,726
1934	758,704	758,704	947,653	950,295
1935	700,672	700,672	995,627	1,049,389

Year ended Oct. 31	*Teachers' Contributions*	*Government Contribution*	*Interest from Province*	*Payment to Teachers*
1936	$ 698,975	$ 698,559	$ 1,054,185	$ 1,195,992
1937	842,838	703,649	1,109,816	1,300,301
1938	873,229	727,729	1,154,150	1,354,750
1939	891,009	742,666	1,216,548	1,400,458
1940	912,101	760,213	1,282,217	1,472,521
1941	1,075,434	768,744	1,356,016	1,587,156
1942	1,128,381	806,528	1,427,751	1,578,725
1943	1,187,186	848,116	1,512,105	1,581,808
1944	1,270,892	1,266,216	1,603,578	1,578,453
1945	1,356,236	1,355,422	1,704,529	1,696,970
1946	1,681,367	1,679,404	1,843,241	1,894,954
1947	1,817,053	1,815,327	1,984,517	2,003,190
1948	2,046,499	2,044,837	2,161,268	2,015,770
1949	2,264,447	2,263,202	2,360,902	2,477,233
1950	2,748,640	2,505,419	2,566,770	2,985,547
1951	4,291,132	2,863,698	2,827,920	3,302,806
1952	5,059,910	4,377,570	3,207,556	3,645,715
1953	5,662,848	4,779,658	3,638,106	4,138,900
1954	*2,470,880	2,653,650	3,965,738	4,708,493
1955	6,512,468	5,344,778	4,644,244	5,641,800
1956	7,466,816	5,980,391	5,220,737	6,365,318
1957	8,543,197	9,540,804	6,058,720	7,160,010
1958	9,734,875	10,732,677	6,944,509	8,010,641
1959	11,222,674	12,219,739	7,949,815	8,881,073
1960	13,156,124	14,154,556	9,202,387	10,337,626
1961	14,790,812	15,789,695	10,501,839	11,919,568
1962	16,234,843	17,233,834	11,934,580	13,686,043
1963	17,697,128	17,825,889	14,537,554	15,552,916
1964	19,574,701	19,766,696	16,413,835	18,636,726
1965	21,819,884	22,092,041	17,506,846	20,386,045
1966	24,618,219	25,110,706	35,502,663	23,680,968
1967	28,436,455	29,137,620	38,829,486	26,516,517
1968	34,361,058	35,646,055	42,517,316	30,741,170
1969	41,800,524	43,701,963	47,180,208	35,258,790
	**25,740,348			
1970	45,187,074	43,060,231	50,502,329	42,442,434
1971	51,772,320	47,361,621	67,514,480	52,547,604

*Contributions cover a four month period only (September to December, 1953) because of a changeover from a school year basis to a calendar year basis effective Jan. 1, 1954.

**Effective Jan. 1, 1969, the boards submitted the teachers' contributions monthly and this amount covers the 10 months Jan. 1, 1969, to Oct. 31, 1969.

4. *Mr. Young*—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the Minister of Agriculture and Food table (a) the names and addresses of those persons registered as research facilities and those persons licensed as supply facilities, under the Act respecting the Care and Provision of Animals for Research, since July 22, 1971, to date; (b) the names and addresses of those persons operating pounds, including pounds operated by any humane society, to which the Act respecting the Care and Provision of Animals for Research, (section 1, subsection *e*) applies; and (*c*) the names and addresses of those pound operators whose premises have been inspected by inspectors of the veterinary services branch since enforcement of the Animals for Research Act?

(Answer contained in Sessional Paper No. 51).

7. *Mr. Handleman*—Inquiry of the ministry: What are the actual amounts for 1970, and 1971, and the estimated amounts for 1972 for, (*a*) the total expenditures, and (*b*) the total provincial grant expressed as a percentage of the total expenditure for: 1. The Ottawa Board of Education (i) Elementary, (ii) Secondary; 2. The Ottawa Separate School Board; 3. The Carleton Board of Education (i) Elementary, (ii) Secondary; 4. The Carleton Roman Catholic Separate School Board?

Answer by Minister of Education:

OTTAWA - CARLETON AREA SCHOOL BOARDS
COMPARATIVE DATA – YEARS 1970-1972

	Year	Source	*Equalized Assessment Per Weighted Pupil Used for Grant Calculation*		*Gross Expenditure*		*Net Expenditure*		*Provincial Grant*		*Provincial Grant as a % of Gross Expenditure*		*Provincial Grant as a % of Net Expenditure*	
			Elementary	*Secondary*	*Elementary*	*Secondary*	*Elementary*	*Secondary*	*Elementary*	*Secondary*	*Elementary*	*Secondary*	*Elementary*	*Secondary*
Ottawa	1970	A.F.R	65,699	99,316	22,842,035	33,992,094	21,902,874	29,924,473	4,848,277	15,046,839	21.23	44.27	22.14	50.28
Board of	1971	Estimates	74,577	105,050	24,199,009	40,331,359	22,919,462	34,996,559	6,286,000	18,300,000	25.98	45.37	27.43	52.29
Education	1972	Estimates	83,331	107,875	24,663,521	44,959,875	24,273,521	40,465,875	7,091,000	21,900,000	28.75	48.71	29.21	54.12
Ottawa	1970	A.F.R.	17,479		22,492,071		20,910,103		16,146,690		71.79		77.22	
RCSS	1971	Estimates	19,971		24,915,000		23,461,760		17,746,000		71.23		75.64	
Board	1972	Estimates	22,174		24,905,000		23,421,180		17,480,331		70.19		74.63	
Carleton	1970	A.F.R.	32,814	77,481	14,987,731	13,349,169	14,754,719	13,204,677	8,561,938	7,882,193	57.13	59.05	58.03	59.59
Board of	1971	A.F.R.	36,935	84,430	16,850,085	16,257,873	16,296,429	15,837,761	10,511,903	10,004,369	62.38	61.54	64.50	63.17
Education	1972	Estimates	37,861	82,341	19,568,781	19,416,436	18,967,781	18,939,436	12,982,451	13,335,163	66.34	68.68	68.44	70.41
Carleton	1970	A.F.R.	14,419		7,831,623		7,684,733		5,905,984		75.41		76.85	
RCSS	1971	Estimates	16,542		8,788,406		8,650,606		7,073,950		80.49		81.77	
Board	1972	Estimates	16,060		10,662,154		10,474,554		9,166,177		85.97		87.51	

NOTES

(1) Source – A.F.R. means the Annual Financial Return prepared by the board and certified by the auditor of the board. This is the final accounting for the year's operation.

(2) Source – Estimates mean the financial budget prepared and adopted by the board upon which the amounts of the requisitions to Municipalities are based.

(3) Net expenditure represents gross expenditure reduced by provision for reserve for working funds, provision for Reserve Funds–Other, charge backs by municipalities and revenue from sources other than local taxation, Provincial grants, reserves and Reserve Funds.

(4) Provincial grant represents General Legislative Grants (inclusive of Education Mill Rate Subsidy) and reimbursement of Canada Pension Plan payments.

April 12, 1972.

8. *Mr. Bounsall*—Inquiry of the ministry: Would the Attorney General provide a complete list of the names and addresses of all persons licensed in Ontario to act as private investigators, and a complete list of all persons, partnerships or companies licensed to engage in the business of providing private investigators for whom they are employed?

(Answer contained in Sessional Paper No. 52).

CONTENTS

Friday, May 26, 1972

OHC advertising, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Deans 2839

Study of performance loan programme, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Sargent 2841

Conversion of aircraft for firefighting, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Reid 2842

Study of performance loan programme, question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 2844

Emergency measures branch, questions of Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Lewis 2844

Land purchases for Highway 406, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald 2845

Metro housing shortage, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald 2845

OHC purchase of Hydro land, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis 2847

Re-testing of accident-prone drivers, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Roy 2847

Management of CNE and Ontario Place, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Reid 2847

Government buildings in Thunder Bay, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Foulds 2848

Bicycle paths, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Deacon 2849

Kidnapping of Lee Ann Bedard, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Shulman 2849

Use of alias, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Shulman 2849

Updating of car registrations, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Germa 2849

Tabling answers to questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8 on the order paper (also see appendix) Mr. Stewart 2850

Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 2850

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, continued 2851

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Stewart, agreed to 2871

Appendix 2872



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 73

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, May 29, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 29, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our students today in the east gallery are from Herron Valley Junior High School of Toronto, St. Edward's School of Nipigon and St. Anne's Separate School of Mattawa. In the west gallery are students from Manitouwadge Public School of Manitouwadge and St. Lucy's School of Toronto. At 3 o'clock we will be joined in the east gallery by students from St. Joseph's Separate School of Tillsonburg.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF CHAIRMAN OF OEC

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I hope you will permit me to put to the Treasurer, since it concerns the Economic Council of Ontario. I know its jurisdiction is shared with another minister but I wanted to ask him why the chairman of the Ontario Economic Council has been permitted to continue in that capacity and at the same time to campaign actively, politically, as the nominated federal Progressive Conservative candidate in Don Valley?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, since the office of the chairman of the Economic Council is specifically listed with deputy ministers and assistant Crown attorneys in the Public Service Act in the group prohibited from seeking elected office, why was Dr. Gillies not treated in the same way as Mr. Paul Dick, the assistant Crown attorney of Renfrew county, who was dismissed two weeks ago?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is a question which should properly be put to the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis).

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We'll look forward to him coming in later in the question period.

An hon. member: Why not take it as notice?

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions from the hon. Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is an interesting question.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I will pass until a few more members of the ministry come in.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Treasurer. Why does the Department of Municipal Affairs continue to erode Wentworth county prior to any decision on the boundaries of the Hamilton-Wentworth-Burlington regional government? Specifically, why has the department come to the conclusion that approximately 50 square miles of Wentworth county should go with Waterloo?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I suggest, with great respect, that that question is argumentative and would be better asked during the course of that bill being presented to the House.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: There is a statement in today's media from this minister. If the minister is going to make statements outside the House he should be prepared to answer them in the House. Why does the minister say it is argumentative? It is not. It is based on fact as the minister has made it known to the Wentworth county council.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, (a) I have not made any statement outside the House; (b) a question which starts off, "Why does the minister want to erode Wentworth county," in my thinking, sir, with respect,

would be construed as an argumentative question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister may answer the question or not, as he sees fit. In this particular case he has chosen not to provide an answer.

The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I think it is a clear indication of his lack of responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Wentworth have further questions?

AMATEUR HOCKEY ASSOCIATION'S BAN ON GIRL PLAYER

Mr. Deans: Yes, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister of Labour investigate the recent action of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association in its refusal to allow a Toronto girl to play organized hockey within the confines of its organization? Will he take a position in favour of permitting persons to play regardless of their sex?

Mr. Singer: Play what? Hockey?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for bringing this matter to my attention although I have already contacted some of my officials concerning the Women's Equal Employment Opportunity Act. I am informed that this case does not come under the Act. However, I would like to pursue this matter a little further and report to the member.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I thought he would.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Wentworth have further questions?

Mr. Deans: I have but I cannot think of anyone here I could ask.

Mr. Speaker: Then the hon. member has no question at the moment. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It hasn't improved.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPALITIES FOR SEWAGE TREATMENT

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. Since the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton receives 66⅔ per cent financial assistance on its sewage programme, is the minister considering introducing legislation that would treat other municipalities in a similar fashion?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: Would the minister care to elaborate on the "no" and say why?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think there are very special reasons in connection with Ottawa-Carleton. To begin with, it was a plan for the entire region, a sewage treatment and water report prepared, as I recall, by MacLaren's and forecasting the needs to the year 2,000. It indicated a population growth of something like, as I recall, 300,000 people to some 600,000 or 700,000 people—three-quarters of a million—and indicated the costs of doing so, which were large. The government of Canada indicated to us that it was prepared to contribute one-third of the cost, it being the capital of our country. and on that basis, we agreed to contribute one-third.

I might say that if you can take into account tax reduction, if you take into account the 15 per cent oversizing which might have been applicable and probably would have been applicable, in that area, then our contribution of about a third can be explained and is perhaps comparable to what might be done in other municipalities. However, we make no apologies for what we have done. It was a comprehensive plan, approved jointly by the governments of Canada and Ontario and the regional municipality. Conditional upon both our aid, of course, is that there should be an equalization of rates in the sewered and watered area, and this will be accomplished.

I think if other municipalities come forward with that sort of far-reaching plan, they may well be looked at. But there is no change in policy at the present time.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that the city of Windsor for the years 1966-1971 spent 42.3 per cent of its total capital budget on sewer and pollution abatement, that is, a total of $24 million, and that it is practically impossible for a municipality to continue such capital expenditures in that line without financial assistance from the province and federal government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I was not aware, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: Would the minister look into that and then reply to the municipality?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure that this is before the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld). The province has moved to help a number of small municipalities where the costs have been excessively high. I read those newspaper clippings in the member's favourite newspaper, and I don't think that anyone has indicated that the cost per household as yet is such that provincial assistance would be comparable with other municipalities.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): It may be necessary in Valley East.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East, a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member from Sudbury chimes in that it may be necessary in Valley East, I think, as part of a comprehensive programme for the emerging regional government in Sudbury. That is something which will have to be looked at.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The Treasurer is not suggesting that there is more sewage in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton to give it special treatment, is he?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member is far more expert on that subject than I would be.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East with a supplementary.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary question of the minister: Is the government not in a position now to indicate its policy, based on the suggestion of the former Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr), that it was going to increase the grants to 75 per cent for sewage and water for those areas which could not afford it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that is a question which the member might well ask the Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Martel: Well, I have. In view of the fact that the minister is still waiting for the decision of cabinet, is cabinet in a position now, or has it discussed the possibility of raising the grant to 75 per cent?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: When we have discussed it and when we do discuss it, government policy will be announced here in the fullness of time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Martel: That is mental gymnastics.

LIQUOR REGULATIONS CHANGE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Solicitor General, the minister who reports to the House for the Liquor Licence Board and the Liquor Control Board.

Is the cabinet committee, which was examining possible changes in those two laws, still extant and functioning? Whether it is or not, is some consideration being given to change the laws governing Sunday drinking, particularly at golf courses and institutions, and facilities like that, so that it is no longer necessary to serve a full-course meal when somebody wants a cold beer after a game of golf?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the committee is not extinct, I think it's extant.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is extant?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is in existence. The revision in depth of the two Acts, the Liquor Control Act and the Liquor Licence Act has been proceeded with by the two boards in conformity with an indication that was given at the last session. I do have before me a preliminary draft, in general, relating to the whole field. It is not likely that it will be proceeded with during this session, however.

There are some major policy decisions involved, which go beyond the two Acts themselves, and what ministry the boards will continue to function under and report through to the Legislature in the future. In recent times, I have spoken to both chairmen to ask them whether there are certain policy or practice changes that they would like to move ahead of the complete revision in depth of the two Acts. They will be placing those before me.

The question of the extension of drinking on Sundays, when considered, will not be done in the context of something at the 19th hole; it will be done in the context of general Sunday consumption of alcoholic beverages and that will be a policy decision which will be announced when it is determined.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the minister aware of any special policy of more

enthusiastic or stringent enforcement of those rules and regulations compared with, say, previous years?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary.

Mr. Roy: I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he doesn't feel, or if he could advise the House today, that these laws in relation to alcohol and food are somewhat outdated? And if he might look into the situation, for instance, in Ottawa at the National Arts Centre where the bar had to be closed one Sunday in April because of this particular law on the proper proportion of food and liquor.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, first of all the liquor laws of this province are not outdated—

Mr. Roy: The minister doesn't think so?

An hon. member: He is!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That makes them outdated.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would welcome at this juncture a foolscap sheet of suggestions—in fact, I would ask the Leader of the Opposition if he would give me his five changes, one, two, three, four, five—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is the minister talking about? I put one to him before I asked the question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, the member asked me a question. He didn't put a position.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I gave the minister a full list last year. He hasn't done anything about them yet.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I say with respect, I would welcome the member's suggestions, but not—

Mr. Shulman: But the minister doesn't pay any attention to our suggestions. We have given him suggestions for 10 years; he hasn't acted on any of them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, it is trite to use the liquor laws of Ontario as a whipping boy, using such words as "archaic" and "old-fashioned." I would suggest, I would ask —in fact, I would enlist the good sound thinking of members opposite me, all members, to list changes—

An hon. member: Give us a copy of the report.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —to say, "If I were chairman of the Liquor Licence Board I would tomorrow do A, B, C, D."

Mr. Deans: In other words, the minister has no ideas of his own.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why doesn't the minister sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The member for Owen Sound has his problems solved.

Mr. Sargent: No, they are not.

Mr. Speaker: Order! order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Getting back to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: The minister is supposed to show leadership.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have. I can show the member the changes we have made—

Mr. Speaker: This is completely out of order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the National Gallery in Otatwa—

Mr. Roy: National Arts Centre.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I believe that they have nine licences for those premises.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): When one would do it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They are subject on Sunday to the same laws that all premises and all citizens of Ontario are subject to—that is, on Sunday the liquor is served with meals as defined by the Liquor Licence Act. The board of management of the National—

Mr. Roy: Arts Centre.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —Arts Centre has seen fit not to open up the dining lounge on Sunday because it is only within a dining lounge that anybody can serve food on Sunday—

Mr. Roy: That is what we mean by archaic.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Contrary to the report that the hon. member is putting his faith in, it is not because they have run afoul of the 50-50 requirement. They just have not opened up their dining lounges on Sunday and therefore they cannot serve liquor on Sunday.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By way of supplementary questions, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister when the cabinet committee on liquor laws last met, if in fact, it has met since he has resumed this responsibility? A second supplementary: Is he prepared to say that he believes that the law which forbids the serving of a cold beer after a game of golf in premises which are licensed under normal circumstances is the sort of rule which should not be called archaic and outdated?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the cabinet committee on liquor has not met for some considerable period of time. The last time that the—

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: That is what the ministers are getting paid for.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The last time that the practices and procedures were revised, they were dealt with by the cabinet as a whole upon consideration of a package which I presented to them. Now, the second, this new phase—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): What kind of package?

Mr. Deans: Don't tell me you don't understand it, after we explained it.

Mr. Cassidy: A brown paper package, eh?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They didn't understand at the time; they don't understand now.

Mr. Deans: It takes you so long to get to the point.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. members scoffed at open-air drinking; we now have the finest open-air drinking—

Mr. Reid: Scoffed?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You scoffed, yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Quaffed, not scoffed!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: You have got the wrong guy.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: To the Leader of the Opposition, of course, I do not express my personal opinions at this time. I present a package to the committee and to the cabinet and these decisions are government decisions.

An hon. member: In a brown paper bag.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: Can the minister explain why he hasn't acted on any of the suggestions and criticisms that have been presented here annually by numerous members on the other side—as, for example, the restrictions as to whether you must drink standing up or sitting down, depending on the establishment?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is the most expert in propounding the myths relating to the liquor laws. I have invited suggestions from all members of the House, but if he doesn't send me a list I won't feel hard done by, because—

Mr. Reid: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —concerning the matter to which he keeps referring, it is possible to have drinking in Ontario sitting down or standing up—

Mr. Shulman: But never both in the same premises.

An hon. member: Or at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member is completely off base.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is possible to do that, Mr. Speaker, I assure you, within the right premises. And I may say—

Mr. Shulman: Within the right premises —right!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have another question?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that was referred—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. How often does the Leader of the Opposition get to pre-empt the privileges of this House to ask questions?

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Let's not get into that foolishness.

Mr. Speaker: May I say that I completely and totally disagree with the suggestion. The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked one question at the opening of this session.

Mr. Stokes: And one later on.

Mr. Speaker: He asked one later on, and as far as I am concerned he has the opportunity to ask further questions at this time.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF CHAIRMAN OF OEC

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Premier that I put previously to the Treasurer concerning the chairmanship of the Ontario Economic Council.

Can he explain why the chairman has been permitted to continue in that capacity and at the same time to actively campaign politically as the nominated federal Progressive Conservative candidate in Don Valley?

And a second question associated with it: Since the office of chairman of the Economic Council is listed, with deputy ministers and other senior governmental officials, including assistant Crown attorneys, in the Public Service Act in the group prohibited from seeking elected office, why was Dr. Gillies not treated in the same way as Mr. Paul Dick, whose case was discussed here last week?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I'll be delighted to look into the matter. I am not sure as to the interpretation of the law as it applies to the chairman of the Economic Council. I'll certainly take a look at it.

The policy has been that if a person is not excluded by the legislation he can campaign, certainly in my view. If the writ had been issued, as it was rumoured to have been some few days ago, then it would not be appropriate to be chairman of the council at the same time as the campaign was actively on. I will take a look at the legislation, or have the Attorney General's office take a look at it, and get an interpretation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And report to the House, please. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the provincial Treasurer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why does the member keep jumping up that way?

Interjections by hon. members.

STUDY OF WATER DIVERSION IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Stokes: Is the Treasurer aware of a study that was requested of Ontario Hydro by the economic planning branch of his department to look into the cost-benefit analysis of water diversions, power dams on rivers in northern Ontario flowing into James Bay and Hudson Bay? Has he made a copy of that study available to the Department of Natural Resources, or the department concerned with energy, in order that they can make up their minds as to what they are going to do with water in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I think I had better take that question as notice and get back to the member.

Mr. Stokes: In taking my question as notice, will he ensure that adequate consultation is undertaken with people in those areas that may be adversely affected by an imbalance of the ecology resulting from a diversion or the construction of dams as proposed by Ontario Hydro and his planning branch?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that is a reasonable request, Mr. Speaker. I would just say to the hon. member I am not aware of any particular dams or diversions that are being contemplated in northern Ontario at the present time.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister not aware of these maps showing storage dams, diversion dams, diversion channels, diversion routes and power dams in four or five locations? Is he aware of photographs that are being taken of sites that have been cleared for power sites?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I'm sorry, I am not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stokes: I'll make them available to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has the answer to a question previously asked.

WEEKEND PARKING FOR PUBLIC AT DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR LOTS

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last Tuesday, I believe, the hon. member for York-Forest Hill asked a question concerning the use of the York St. parking lot. At the time I undertook to give him the information; however, I have found out since that this does not come under my ministry. But I understand that if the hon. member would direct his question to the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow), he would be glad to provide the information.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are the lots at York St. on the west side of the Workmen's Compensation Board, not under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Not the operation of it, Mr. Speaker. The operation, the rental or the use of it comes under Government Services.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, can I direct my question to the Minister of Government Services, or does he feel he has to look into it? The summer will be over, and I'm giving the minister an opportunity to make himself a nice fellow.

An hon. member: Question, question.

Mr. Givens: I know, I know.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There's an opportunity for him.

Mr. Givens: Will the minister look into the question of opening up the lots that are under provincial jurisdiction, and which evidently he manages for either supervised or unsupervised parking on weekends—on Saturdays and Sundays—to the thousands of people who roam the area trying to get across to the island and have nowhere to park their cars? Would the minister look into it and come back with an answer before next weekend so that he can open up the lots next weekend and for the rest of the summer?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He wants to be a good guy, doesn't he?

Mr. Givens: It will cost you nothing; the taxpayers have paid for those lots.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister is on his feet to provide an answer.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, after the hon. member's question last week, I think I realized the lots he was referring to were those on the west side of York St. Is that right?

Mr. Givens: No, not just the west side of York St., but the Workmen's Compensation lots and all the provincial lots. There are several of them down there.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the question asked was regarding the parking lots of the Department of Labour property at the foot of York St. To my knowledge the lots are those on the west side that were formerly associated with the Department of Labour building at 8 York St. when that was occupied by the Department of Labour.

There are, Mr. Speaker, about 80 parking spaces on Crown-owned property and there are approximately another 100 parking spaces on property owned by the Toronto Harbour Commissioners. Last Thursday, I believe, I met with the chairman of the Toronto Parking Authority and he and his officials, along with representatives of my ministry, are looking into the possibility of releasing this parking space to be operated by the Toronto Parking Authority, but I have no definite agreement yet. I might say again that this refers to the property on the west side of York St. and not the lots of the Workmen's Compensation Board, which do not come under my ministry.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It should be the Liquor Control Board—

Mr. Givens: A supplementary: Whom do the Workmen's Compensation lots come under then?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: A supplementary to the Minister of Labour: Are the Workmen's Compensation lots under his jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I know the Workmen's Compensation Board reports to me; this I know. I have never had any—

Mr. Deans: We are not sure that they do.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: They will.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why don't you fellows get together?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I will be glad to get the information. I've never discussed this matter before but I will and report to the member very shortly—tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The provincial Treasurer has the answer to a question previously asked.

TREASURY BILLS

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the other day, the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) asked about Treasury bills and the difference in rates. I undertook to provide a brief explanation, which I will. This was as of a report dated April 19, but the situation would not have changed. As of April 12, 1972, there were $3,834,000,000 federal Treasury bills outstanding, held as follows:

Bank of Canada, $865,000,000; chartered banks, $2,707,000,000; government accounts, $72,000,000; the general public, $190,000,000; for a total of $3,834,000,000.

It follows, therefore, that since 95 per cent of the outstanding amount is either held by the Bank of Canada for purposes of monetary policy management or by the banks as mandatory secondary reserve requirements, the level of interest rates relating to federal Treasury bills does not necessarily bear any relationship to other market rates. Included in the foregoing amount shown as holdings for the general public, would be the inventory of bills held by investment dealers, financed by banks through their day-to-day loan facilities, a secondary reserve instrument, reducing the freely traded amount even further.

That's essentially the explanation which I gave the member for York South the other day, but this is perhaps putting it a little more succinctly. I think that the correct term to use is that Treasury bills, in effect, have a captive market.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

WCB HOSPITAL FIRE CLAIMS

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain the very lengthy delay in settling the claims of those persons injured in the fire at the Workmen's Compensation Board hospital in 1967, prior to the election twice back?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I've missed part of his question. The hon. member asked a question here.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, explain the lengthy delay in settling the legal claims of those persons injured in the fire in 1967 at the Workmen's Compensation Board hospital.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I'm not aware of these claims at the present time, but I would be glad if the hon. member would supply me with names of some of the specific claims and I'd be glad to look into it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, my question was of the Premier. I think he's just stepped out for a minute.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

SUMMER JOBS AT LCBO STORES

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker: Is the Solicitor General aware that the managers of the Liquor Control Board stores in Windsor have been told that in their summer hiring programme, they can hire only Conservatives or those persons—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): What else is new?

Mr. Bounsall: —approved by the local Conservatives—

Mr. Ruston: They didn't have to be told.

Mr. Bounsall: —with the result that several students, who had been employed last year in these liquor stores and were told this spring that they could expect to be rehired, have been told now they can't and for that reason?

An hon. member: They didn't have to be told.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I assume, Mr. Speaker, that it's only the first part of his question that the hon. member expects to have answered. I would assume that he also found this out in the course of his trying to place some students with the board. I may say

that I know of no such restriction, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bounsall: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Bounsall: Would the minister investigate this situation in Windsor and report back to the House?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If the hon. member would supply me with the names of the people who made the remarks and at what time, what place and to whom they made the remarks to, I'd be very pleased to check into the matter.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

GOVERNMENT PLANE ACCIDENT

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Premier. Is the Premier aware and has he had a report that the government's King Air plane had an accident at the Kenora airport? Can he tell us if he's aware of it, what the consequences were, whether anyone was hurt and who was on board at the time?

Mr. Roy: Any cabinet ministers involved?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have had no report. I knew that the King Air, along with the Otter, was being used during the latter part of the week to take personnel to the north. I hadn't heard of any accident to the King Air over the weekend, but I shall inquire.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Here's a report that says the Prime Minister is still kicking tires on a $2 million jet. Is that correct?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The question is absolutely out of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh. I had an answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Sargent: Point of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has no point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: We've watched you try and defend the government, Mr. Speaker. Let him answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: The question was out of order. It should not be answered.

Mr. Sargent: Let them run their own show, let them alone.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will please be seated. The hon. member for Wentworth.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Prime Minister: In view of the growing acceptance among the people of Manitoba, and particularly among the insurance executives in Manitoba, of the government of Manitoba's auto insurance programme, will the government of Ontario consider instituting such a programme in Ontario, in order that the citizens of Ontario can also benefit to the same extent?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must say I'm intrigued by the phrase "growing acceptance," which indicated to me that there was a singular lack of acceptance in the first instance.

Mr. Deans: Oh, there was.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Which is a great admission to have coming from the hon. member for Wentworth, which admission I hadn't heard during the debates of last fall.

Mr. Deans: I am always prepared to—

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I would say, in spite of the fact that he thinks there is a growing acceptance—which, as I say, indicates there wasn't complete acceptance in the first instance—no, we are not considering following the Manitoba example in that particular respect.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Is the Prime Minister aware of the growing acceptance among the previous auto insurance industry, particularly to the effect that they are now making public statements praising the plan and its effectiveness and cost-saving factors?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to state that I have read conflicting reports about the success or lack of success of

the Manitoba scheme, and as I said to the hon. member, we really aren't contemplating following suit here in this province.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: Is the Prime Minister aware that the public in Manitoba is not very happy with the insurance scheme outlined by the hon. member? They are tired of waiting for weeks and months, standing in a line-up—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Reid: —and putting up with bureaucratic officials.

Mr. Martel: That should be worth $5,000 to the next campaign.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. Attorney General has the answer to a question previously asked.

LEGAL AID FOR US CITIZENS

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Essex-Kent asked a question of me on May 19, in reference to the policy that relates to the granting of legal aid to United States citizens who may be charged with offences in Canada.

Under section 16, subsection 9 of the Legal Aid Act, non-residents are eligible to apply for legal aid, but they must have their certificates approved by the director. In the past few years applications have been made in certain circumstances and the advice of the advisory committee was sought in those cases. It was decided that the provincial director should apply the same principles in determining whether a certificate should or should not be issued to a non-resident, as an area director would apply in issuing a certificate to a resident.

The decision I've mentioned applies in criminal matters. In civil matters the same would apply, but he would have to approve an application and it has to be shown that refusal of legal assistance would present a great hardship to the applicant.

I think the case that the hon. member was raising particularly concerned three Americans who were charged in the courts in Windsor. I would advise that those three people had not applied for legal aid assistance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

ABSENCE OF JUDGE FROM DUTY

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Some time ago in this House the Attorney General was asked questions in relation to Magistrate Glen Marshman of London. In view of the fact that apparently the Canadian press has reported that the judicial inquiry is looking into his activities and, secondly, in view of the fact that the minister outlined some time ago that he was on special assignment, I wonder if he might enlighten the House as to what this special assignment is and what is the particular status of this provincial court judge?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned that there was a judicial inquiry—

Mr. Roy: Judicial council.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I said before in the House that I was not in a position, at that point, to make a statement. I anticipate I shall be shortly but not at the present time. The assignment is under the direction of the chief judge and he's carrying out work in the court offices in Toronto.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the minister doesn't agree that his silence about the status of this judge is in fact somewhat of an indictment, not relating to the House; the longer he is silent on this, the more the rumours are flying around?

Hon. Mr. Bales: If I were to make any statement at all, it would only add to the difficulty of the matter. I think it is important that I preserve the security and the innocence of the judge until such time as a statement is made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. Singer: May I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: I am not at all sure that in view of the minister's reply, that a supplementary would be in order. We will try it.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the minister is going to bring before the House any amendments to the Act which allow review of the conduct of provincial judicial appointments, so that pending such an investigation as is going on, there could perhaps be a suspension?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question is probably in order.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think the question is quite in order, Mr. Speaker. I would say that I have been giving very careful and serious consideration to this, because I have been concerned as to certain aspects of the legislation as it now stands.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

PIPELINE ROUTE LOCATION

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Justice regarding a proposed pipeline running through Sandwich West: Has an individual farmer any recourse in determining where on his farm the pipeline can or cannot be placed?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in those cases there is usually a period of negotiation. If it is a private pipeline company putting this through, it is a matter of negotiation between them. If, of course, it came to expropriation—and I would have to check and know what company was involved to ascertain whether they had the power to expropriate—then it is a matter that could be dealt with under the legislation.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In the case of the sudden appearance of the surveyors, it would seem there had not been any previous negotiation. Is it the minister's department that could help these people in this matter?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Not necessarily. If surveyors appear on one's property without prior warning, then they are really not free to enter it without consent.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

DOME PETROLEUM PIPELINE

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour on the same topic as the member for Sandwich-Riverside: Did officials of the energy branch attend the National Energy Board hearings in relation to the application of Dome Petroleum to run a transmission line between Sarnia and Toledo via Lake St. Clair-Essex county? If they did attend, what position did the government take in relation to this application?

Secondly, does the minister's department have any authority other than the safety factor in relation to this particular pipeline, which I believe does come under the jurisdiction of the National Energy Board?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Replying to the second part of your question, our ministry is involved, of course, under the Trench Excavators Protection Act for safety purposes. As for the first part, I would have to take it as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY ACT

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Could the Minister of Labour give the House a report on the progress of his department in drafting the regulations applying to Bill 90, the Industrial Safety Act, which was passed last July?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the hon. member and the members of the House that the regulations concerning the Safety Inspection Act have been approved by the registrar and that they are in the process of being proclaimed.

Mr. Gisborn: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: It seems to me—am I not correct—the minister's answer is exactly the same as the last time we raised the question. This is the seventh time we have raised the question; and we have been told before that it was approved and now was being drafted. I want to know what the procrastination is all about in such an important piece of legislation.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the impatience of my hon. friend, but before these regulations could have been drafted it took several months to get in touch with a great number of associations interested in safety measures, and that is the main reason we have checked with every possible safety association in the country and elsewhere to make sure we come out with the best regulations ever.

SIMCOE DAY

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Simcoe East.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. In view of the—

Mr. Sargent: The member was just talking to him a minute ago. He sat down beside him.

Mr. G. E. Smith: In view of the support that I have had from the municipalities, from organizations and from individuals in support of private member's Bill 25, An Act respecting Simcoe Day, would the government consider implementing government legislation involving the principle of this bill?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the hon. member's very great interest in this particular subject, and the representations made to him by the municipalities in that area and by many citizens. Of course the name of Simcoe is a very historic one in this province and I fully understand the hon. member's interest in this particular bill and the purpose behind it. Certainly it is something that the government—

Mr. Reid: It sounds like it is under consideration!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —might consider; and as a result of the hon. member's question, certainly the government will give this matter very careful consideration.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Premier give the same consideration to the other private members' bills that are on the books? Perhaps the ones that have received such widespread support as well as publicity!

Mr. Speaker: The question is not supplementary. The hon. member for Essex South is attempting to get the floor.

All right, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: That hurt!

A question of the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has 30 seconds.

STUDY OF PERFORMANCE LOAN PROGRAMME

Mr. Sargent: I can't do it!

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter. I'd like to ask the Premier if he is concerned about the $35 million in the trade and industry branch that the government is going to take six months to find where it went? Is the Premier concerned about the fact that $28 million of this has no interest on it, to American firms; and can he defend his position as described in the Globe and Mail this morning, that he has no national concern for the takeover of US industry because of this? Why is it going to take six months to find out where the $28 million is?

Mr. Roy: Good question!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member could tell me which one of the four questions that he asked, theoretically as one, he wants answered first?

If the hon. member is asking if we are interested; yes, we are interested. If the hon. member is asking whether or not there has been a change in policy with respect to forgivable loans to American corporations or branch plants of American corporations, the answer to that is yes. If the hon. member is asking why it will take six months to get some of this information, the answer to that very simply Mr. Speaker, is, anything we do here we do very thoroughly. If it requires six months as suggested by the minister, it will take six months; and we will have the answer for the hon. member.

I forget what the fourth part of that one-part question was.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Bales presented the annual report of the Ontario Municipal Board for the year ending Dec. 31, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

The hon. member for High Park.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS' LIABILITY ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to relieve Medical Practitioners, Registered Nurses and Others from Liability in respect of Voluntary Emergency First Aid and Medical Services.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to relieve medical practitioners and others from liability in respect of voluntary emergency first aid assistance rendered at or near the scene of an accident or other sudden emergency.

DOG TAX AND LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Paterson moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the Act would allow keepers of pheasants, water fowl and certain ornamental birds to comply with or fall under the terms of the general Act.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR CROWN EMPLOYEES ACT

Clerk of the House: The fourth order, House in committee of the whole, Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

House in committee on Bill 105, An Act to provide for Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 105—are there any questions, comments or amendments to any of the first five sections?

On section 1?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Would the minister explain to the committee the significance of the amendment made to item (g) of subsection 1 of clause 1 of the bill?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): Did the hon. member say subsection (g)?

Mr. Renwick: Subclause (g) of subsection 1 of clause 1 of the bill, the definition of "employee." Would the minister explain the changes that were made from the time the bill went into the committee until it returned to this committee?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, if the hon. member will give me a moment, Mr. Chairman, I don't see any change, in the copies I have, between the reprinted bill or the original bill. I fail to see the change.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could point out to the minister that item (g) on the first page of the bill indicates that there was an amendment in committee, as indicated by the traditional markings. Would the minister explain that change? I am looking at the reprinted bill as amended by the administration.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): An extra clause, (f), has been put in. The rest is renumbered.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: No, that's not it. There is a substantial change in the definition of the term "employee." I am asking the minister to explain it to the committee.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will in a minute. Yes, it has just been simplified to delete the organizations that were included—for example, the Liquor Control Board—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! There is too much background noise. We have difficulty hearing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —Ontario Housing Corp. and so on. As the hon. member will recall, we discussed that in the standing committee.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill?

Carried.

Any other questions, comments or amendments to sections 2, 3, 4 or 5?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of the committee that for practical purposes the government is insisting on granting the Civil Service Association of Ontario a monopoly with respect to the bargaining rights of the employees in the civil service. At the present time, speaking of the civil service proper—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Which section is this?

Mr. Renwick: Section 4, Mr. Chairman, and section 5—particularly section 4.

Section 4 of the bill, Mr. Chairman, provides that in order to have a representation vote, an employee organization must obtain not less than 35 per cent of the employees in the appropriate bargaining unit. The minister, on being questioned in the committee about this, was quite categorical that the appropriate bargaining committee for the civil service proper of the Province of Ontario—that is, not necessarily the employees of the various boards and commissions and agencies of the Crown, but the 50,000-odd employees of the Province of Ontario proper who are the civil servants—will be representatives of the Civil Service Association of Ontario, that that is the appropriate bargaining unit and that it will, just for practical purposes, be

impossible ever for the Civil Service Association to be displaced as the bargaining agent for the Crown employees in the civil service.

I want to say again, as I said in committee, that so far as we are concerned, we are not particularly worried about the Civil Service Association of Ontario being entrenched as such, but we take the position that there are groupings of employees within the civil service of the Province of Ontario who could quite appropriately be designated as bargaining units and bargain for their rights as against the Crown. The example which has been used, and which I think for simplicity can be used again, is the employees of the Ontario Hospitals throughout the Province of Ontario, that the conditions and terms of those employees' employment are distinguishable in certain respects from the employment and the conditions of employment of other Crown employees.

I'm quite certain that various other groupings of employees who have significant differences in their employment from the large other body of the civil service will come to the attention or to the minds of members. For example, the civil servants who are in the employ of the Ministry of Correctional Services in the Province of Ontario.

We believe that it would make sense for such bargaining units to be recognized as being appropriate and that in the initial instance the Civil Service Association, which bargains for them now, should be permitted to bargain for them. If they continue to fulfil their responsibilities and discharge their obligations to the employees that they represent, then that's fine: they will not be subject to any particular threat by any other union that may wish to try to obtain representation rights in place of the Civil Service Association.

But it does seem to us that the position of the government is that this is not going to take place and that there are going to be no groupings of appropriate employee relations in the Province of Ontario that will permit separate bargaining for separate working conditions. The net result is that the Civil Service Association of Ontario is granted a monopoly for the purpose of bargaining for all of the Crown employees in the direct civil service of the Province of Ontario.

We question whether or not that is wise. We question whether or not the bill should pretend that there is some procedure which will be workable and feasible that will permit the Civil Service Association of Ontario to be displaced as the bargaining agent for the whole of the civil service.

I think it will be obvious to all members that for any other employee organization, such as the Canadian Union of Public Employees, to obtain 35 per cent of the employees in the civil service of the Province of Ontario in order that the Canadian Union of Public Employees could apply to the tribunal for a representation vote is purely theoretic and is not going to take place in the province.

It is always difficult to criticize a long-standing organization such as the Civil Service Association of Ontario, but it is subject to the criticisms that each monopoly is subject to; that is, that if you entrench them in their position the likelihood is that they will be less than vigilant about carrying out the responsibilities which they have to such a large body of civil servants as are represented by the civil service of Ontario.

It would appear to me to be almost impossible as such for such a body to discharge the responsibilities which are traditionally known as the collective bargaining responsibilities of an organization that is going to be the bargaining agent for those employees for all time. It is asking too much of any organization, and I'm suggesting to the minister that, in my judgement and in our judgement, that is one of the inherent fallacies in the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, of course again I believe the hon. member heard me say in standing committee that we took this action based on the recommendation of Judge Little. It might be interesting —it will only take a moment—if I could quote from page 28 of Judge Little's report. The judge said:

> Furthermore, in my view the public interest is best served if the public service is not fragmented by the introduction of new units which would give rise to multiple bargaining where the need is not apparent. Support for this principle is found in the submission of the Canadian Union of Public Employees and its locals 878 and 879 with reference to the issues concerning the Don Jail guards and the Metropolitan Toronto court clerks.

It's stated that there is an inclination on the part of the Labour Relations Boards of most jurisdictions to large, all-inclusive units rather than to a proliferation of small, highly-specialized ones. It goes on to propose that direction or encouragement should be given

to the Labour Relations Board or any special board to recognize broad rather than narrow units. When this brief was presented this principle was specifically endorsed by the Civil Service Association of Ontario.

I could go on, because the position is supported by Judge Little in other references that he makes. That is why section 4 is written in the manner in which it is written. I am simply stating, Mr. Chairman, we hold to the recommendation of Judge Little in this respect.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Taking into account the comments of the member for Riverdale and the answer by the minister in this respect, the minister has justified his position on the decision of His Honour Judge Little in relation to the position taken by CUPE. That seems to be the position of most of the affiliates of the congress and the congress itself.

We have a new situation in that the employees of the public service now become the employees under an agreement, a piece of legislation, that locks them into a bargaining unit when they have had no choice of whether or not they want that bargaining union to represent them. In all other cases, there have been applications made for certification to the various labour relations boards to represent a group of people on the decision of that group.

The civil service employees, as we know them today, have grown from 1914 on into what we now call the public service of Ontario. Therefore, if we recognize the submission of His Honour Judge Little and the summation made by the minister in charge of this piece of legislation, why has he not had some predetermination made by the employees as to whether or not they want the Civil Service Association of Ontario to be their bargaining unit, or do they wish to have another union represent them?

If we follow the thinking of the minister and of His Honour Judge Little the only fair approach to the situation would have been that at some point in time, prior to the introduction of this legislation or by provisions in this legislation, there would have been an open vote for application to represent the various employees. If we fall on the side that there should be no fragmentation whatsoever of what we now know as the Civil Service Association, the vote would entail the complete group of 50,000.

It wouldn't be my wish that that be the case, but why have we not given those employees the opportunity to make a choice? The question might have been decided at this point as to whether there was need for a fragmentation in some sense—a thrashing out of the various types of related occupations to make it more plausible and feasible in the eyes of collective bargaining — or whether it would, on a vote, be a suitable bargaining unit for 55,000 people.

It is a large number and there is no doubt, there is no argument whatsoever that they are a related group of employees who should come under one collective bargaining agreement. The problems that we might find, or might assume to find, in a fragmentation of those employees we shall also find when they have one bargaining unit. It has been the case in the past with the frustration of trying to iron out the various jurisdictions of the groups represented in the so-called civil service association.

So I would wonder if the minister would say and make a statement as to why he has not considered a fair approach to it and allowed a representation vote on the subject before now? Why cannot he provide in this legislation a section that would provide in the future, over a six months' period, a representation vote and an application by—not any union, I wouldn't suggest—but by unions in the relative fields of public employees? It would then be decided once and for all that they have had a fair opportunity to make a choice as to their bargaining unit.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I really don't know how much more I can say. I can't agree that provisions don't exist in the bill for any union to make endeavours, by one means or another, to represent the public service of Ontario.

The hon. member is probably saying that the manner of choosing or determining which unions it shall be is too restrictive. I personally am not prepared to accept that, Mr. Chairman. The option is there for all; for any union to, by a determination of 35 per cent of a bargaining unit and following that 50 per cent of the votes cast—not 50 per cent of the unit's members, 50 per cent of the votes cast—to represent the public service of Ontario. The provisions are there, and I am not about to contemplate any change in that respect, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, if I may just pursue this for a moment on this section. I want it made clear that I am not casting,

nor do I wish to cast, any aspersions on the capabilities of the officers of the Civil Service Association to represent those people; nor am I making a plea or asking for ways to be made possible for other unions to get certification.

But what we should be aware of, what we should allow, is the right of a group of the present employees to disassociate themselves from the Civil Service Association, if it is their own collective opinion, that they are not being represented properly.

Suppose we find a group of 1,000 in the 50,000 with related occupations who are completely dissatisfied with the kind of initiative they can take on their own behalf in this whole conglomeration of collective bargaining when it is one unit. If they are dissatisfied, they can't get out; they have no way to say: "We are not satisfied with the representation; we don't think this type of a procedure is relative to our occupation in our group; we would like to get into another group."

They can't do that; because when they have made an appeal to a particular union, whether it be the Canadian Union of Public Employees, the Building Service Union, or others, they would have to get plainly 51 per cent of the complete group. And that is almost an impossibility. So when you nod your head, Mr. Minister, on that comment, you're saying, "Yes," that there is no possible way that any particular group, to the dissatisfaction of others and in their relative importance to the overall picture, can get out; they are locked in.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Yes; may we return to section 1.(g), Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: No, we have passed section 1. We're at sections 4 and 5.

Mr. Bounsall: You have passed section 1!

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I would like to return to section 1 too.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I am sorry, we've carried those. We can't be going back or we'd never get our business finished. We're on sections 4 and 5.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Such a terrible bill, it should not be—

Mr. Chairman: Sections 4 and 5 are combined.

Shall sections 4 and 5 stand as part of the bill then?

Sections 4 and 5 carried.

Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition on section 6.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Section 6 establishes the bargaining rights of the workers, and it is really one of the three very important sections that established those rights which can be negotiated and finally arbitrated; excluding those other areas which are exclusively the prerogative of government, and they are established, I believe, in section 17.

There are many areas that I think should be discussed in this connection, but one specifically withdraws from the area of negotiation the whole important aspects of establishing superannuation. The justification for removing that from the area of negotiation certainly escapes me.

Mr. Chairman, we debated the principle of the bill a week or two ago. We expressed our objections and voted against the bill in principle, and it is not my intention to discuss the principle of arbitration in this sense at this time. But since the bill, supported by the large Conservative majority, has accepted this concept, then we are simply discussing how best to safeguard in justice and fairness the interests of the workers involved.

I would say to the minister how can he possibly justify, while leaving the whole matter of pay to negotiation and finally arbitration, excerpting the matter of superannuation and say that is clearly the prerogative only of the government and would not fall into the ambit of this section 6. I can't see how that can be justified. I don't believe there is much point in having an amendment to that section which would include it, although certainly if the minister would consider it, I would welcome it if he would put it forward. It seems to me that the only avenue of objection for us in opposition is to vote against the section in total, because it is poorly drawn and does not safeguard the interests of those people employed by the government in any adequate way at all.

The only reason I pick out that point of superannuation is that it seems to be the most easily understood, the clearest flaw in the thinking of the government where it would simply sequester that entirely to its

own unilateral decision, even though it is prepared to at least discuss the matter of pay with the employees in the public service. I wonder if the minister would be prepared to reconsider the government's position and to add the word "superannuation" after "remuneration" in the sixth line?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think not. I might ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to consider a few matters. First, the government has a responsibility for the introduction and enforcement of legislation which controls and protects the pension rights of all people in this province—

Mr. Martel: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —as the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be aware. It would seem to me that there would be a form of conflict if the controller, the government in this case, were on the one hand implementing and enforcing pension legislation, the Pension Benefits Act, and on the other hand bargaining pensions. The bill provides that pensions will not be bargained, but that is not to say employees will not have some influence on the pension plan, because the CSAO has a representative on the Public Service Superannuation Board. But I would hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition would see the inconsistency of legislation pensions across the board in both the public and private sector on the one hand and then negotiating for something that might be at variance with its own legislation on the other.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If I might just pursue that, the pension legislation is not across the board in the public and private sector.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes it is.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would think that in the case of safeguarding of portability in certain circumstances, and so on, that that is true; but the pensions that are payable to employees in almost every field of endeavour, let's say except teaching, are certainly a matter of negotiation as between employer and employee. If the government were prepared to permit these negotiations, then of course the pension legislation would be amended as per the agreement that had been arrived at, or in case no agreement could be achieved as per the ruling of the arbitration board.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 6 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member for Wentworth on his feet to speak?

Mr. Deans: Yes. I want to speak on section 6. I'm really concerned about the way the government has decided to set out the matters which may and may not be bargained for by its employees. I think, as I believe I stated on second reading, that working conditions ought to be subject to negotiation.

Mr. Martel: First and foremost.

Mr. Deans: I think that employees should have the right, for negotiable purposes, to put before management any matter at all pertaining to the conditions of work.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is where we disagree; you are quite right.

Mr. Martel: Why would you disagree with it?

Mr. Deans: Yes, I believe that this is so. I can't understand why anyone would disagree with a position which says that if you're employed by someone you ought to have the right to ask them to consider to change the conditions of the employment. And I don't see why the government takes it upon itself to decide that there are certain matters that cannot even be discussed.

Mr. Martel: Come into the 20th century!

Mr. Deans: That's what negotiation is all about, the right to simply say that I don't like the way things are going and I'd like to talk about them during negotiation with an eye to making them better, from the point of view of the employee. I totally disagree with the position the government has taken in this regard. I consider it to be archaic. I consider it, in fact, to be so archaic as to be unbelievable, considering the position this government puts forward.

We went past this stage in negotiations 50 years ago, and I don't understand why it is that you would deny the employees of the people of this province the opportunity to bargain with their employer for all of the matters that, generally speaking, pertain to the working conditions and all other conditions surrounding their employment with the Province of Ontario. I would like to hear from the minister, since I haven't had the benefit of hearing this, what it is about the civil service that he considers to be so wrong

that they will not permit them—"they" meaning the government, will not permit "them" meaning the civil service—the right to bargain, the right to raise matters other than these very selected, narrow matters that are set out in section 6 of this bill.

I would like to sit down and hear the minister tell me—maybe he can convince me—why it is that this particular section is valuable to the government of Ontario in its dealings with its employees. What is it in the history of the civil service that the minister feels justifies denying them the right to raise any matter at all at the bargaining table? And what is it in the way the civil service has bargained in the past that strikes such fear in the heart of this minister? Is it that they might ask for something that is reasonable perhaps, and the government, in its ideological position that it takes from time to time, will find it impossible to cope with it?

Mr. Martel: Does the minister want to be a dictator?

Mr. Deans: Are you afraid of the civil service? Are you afraid to allow them the right to bargain for their conditions of employment?

It strikes me this can be the only reason for that kind of clause. And, like the Leader of the Opposition, I say to you that I frankly find it extremely difficult to support the clause. I would much prefer to have seen a clause which said in effect that upon having been granted the representation rights, the employees' representative is authorized to bargain with the employer on terms and conditions of employment and all other matters—and all other matters—

Mr. Martel: That's the 20th century we are talking about.

Mr. Deans: —pertaining to the employment and to the working conditions of the employee. I would much prefer to see that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am sure you believe it, but—

Mr. Deans: Can I do that?

Mr. Renwick: What you said first was right, just terms and conditions. Leave out the rest.

Mr. Deans: Yes, that's all it has to be. I think, quite frankly, as far as this clause is concerned that you should stop it at "employment" in the third line. I believe you should simply say that the terms and conditions of employment are subject to negotiation—all of them, without any exclusion—and let's trust to the common sense and good judgement of the people that we hire in the matters that they will raise with you.

What is it that they've ever raised in the past that makes you so afraid of them? What have they ever asked for? What have they ever asked you for that you're so afraid to allow them to raise all matters with you? Wouldn't you rather have them raise those matters with you directly than have it a festering sore in the civil service? Wouldn't you rather give them the right to raise the matters publicly with you at negotiation, rather than have some—

An hon. member: Festering sore!

Mr. Deans: Festering sore, I suppose developing in the civil service that would create all kinds of different problems.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That one's not bothering me too much.

Mr. Deans: Anyway I would move, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Renwick: Wait a minute—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Wait until the member for Riverdale writes it down for you.

Mr. Deans: Well, it doesn't matter, I can write it myself.

Mr. Renwick: I've got it.

Mr. Deans: I move, Mr. Chairman, that section 6 be amended to delete all the words after the word "employment" in the third line.

Mr. Reid: I thought you could write it yourself!

Mr. Deans: He's writing it already.

Mr. Renwick: I'm just his amanuensis.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth moves that clause 6 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "employment" in the third line.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on that. I think there is a great deal wrong with that section 6, certainly when one tries to read it together with section 17. The government gives and the government

takes away, while it gives something it's taking away more.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): That's typical of government, though.

Mr. Singer: Frankly, as I look at the words here, apparently there can be bargaining relating to the methods of effecting promotions and demotions, but when you try and compare that to what's in section 17, you can't talk about the principles and standards governing promotion, demotion and so on—there are a string of words after that as well.

Now what is the difference? And who is going to be able to tell what the difference is between methods of effecting and principles and standards governing? Maybe the minister has some magic answer to the distinction in those two phrases, but it would seem to me that by and large they contemplate the same thing.

So in section 6 you say, "Yes, you can discuss the methods effecting promotions, demotions, transfers and layoffs;" but in section 17 you say, "But be careful, don't discuss the principles." Now what's the difference? What really do you mean?

And when we get to section 17, Mr. Chairman, we will see the anomalies that are put in there; for instance, when you take out of bargaining all the things listed earlier in section 17, what kind of discretion are you going to leave to grievance boards? My reaction would have been to vote against section 6 as it now stands—

Mr. Haggerty: And vote against section 17!

Mr. Singer: And later, to vote against section 17 as it now stands.

Mr. Haggerty: It's terrible legislation.

Mr. Singer: The amendment introduced by the hon. member from Hamilton does that in effect, but really you shouldn't have a section 6 in there at all. The minister tries to have it both ways at once. I would like to know only the most obvious thing at this moment: How can you possibly distinguish between what are methods of effecting promotions and what are principles and standards governing promotions? Without picking out other examples, that theme runs through Sections 6 and 17.

If the government really means that it is giving, because it is taking away the right to strike, then let it give with a full heart. Let it really give. Let not its giving be so limited and confined and crabbed that it is meaningless. This is not what the minister's doing.

Mr. Deans: Let's not be giving and then be taking away.

Mr. Singer: For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, as I say, the reaction of my colleagues and I would be to vote entirely against section 6. The amendment of the hon. member does that in effect, so we'll support that amendment.

Mr. Martel: Charlie, show us some enlightenment.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments? Does the hon. minister wish to comment? All those in favour—

Mr. Singer: Just tell us the difference between methods and principles.

Mr. Chairman: We'll put the question then?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, Mr. Chairman, you may—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, I will. I'll accommodate the member for Sudbury East. By George I will!

Mr. Deans: Please do.

Mr. Singer: All heart today.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wouldn't count on that yet.

Mr. Martel: We don't expect you to go too far.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I thought, Mr. Chairman, when I read in the paper that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party had called me "intransigent" that I'd better live up to my label. So you may find that's the order of things here today.

Mr. Martel: Oh come on, Charlie. Just show us how benevolent you can be.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Charlie, I regard you as fair. It won't change my opinion of you.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I don't intend to do that.

Mr. Deans: He means fair—like poor, fair, good.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill was in the committee and will recall that we made certain amendments. We did take section 6 and 17 together—

Mr. Givens: They were fair.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They are fair, and will give us probably the best of all worlds.

Now I say, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to countenance any amendments that would take away from the government the right to manage. I know of no public jurisdiction where the right to manage is not exclusive to the government.

Mr. Deans: You have the right to manage!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have the right to manage and we believe that it is quite proper for us to refer to, in specific terms in the bill, those areas of management that we believe are exclusive to the government.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I just suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that I was prepared to listen while the other hon. members were talking. So I simply say that the right to manage and those matters that have a relationship to management are not altogether germane only to the public sector; the private sector in its contracts respects the right to manage, and it is usually settled in the agreement. There may be specific departures from that, but in general terms management rights are enshrined in the agreement between employer and employee. If the hon. member knows anything about labour, he would be the first to say that I am right in what I am stating before this House.

Mr. Deans: They are never spelled out in these—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But they are spelled out; and they are respected. The public service and the private sector, I suggest Mr. Chairman, are two different animals.

It is for that purpose that those areas of management rights that should accrue to the government have been spelled out, yes, but taken into context with section 6, particularly the amendment that was made to section 6, makes it quite clear—I would believe clarity is the essence of it now—that it protects the employee from the conduct of management, of the methods it employs in giving effect to those exclusive rights it claims under section 17.

If the hon. members will read section 6 in that context I believe they will agree with me, as did the committee, that we have gone about as far as it is reasonable to go when you talk about a bill, a piece of legislation respecting Crown employees of the Province of Ontario.

Having made those concessions and accepted those amendments in committee, I now submit that we have gone as far as we believe it is right, proper or prudent to do.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question? The member for Sudbury East?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the minister a question? Does the minister feel that the government can't manage and still give the right of its employees to negotiate? That is what you are trying to say. Is it impossible to manage the government affairs and then have to deny the rights of the employees to negotiate with job classification, and so on? You can't do the two?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we believe that would be improper, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No. We want to know what it is that the minister thinks is different in the rights to negotiate and to bargain between the private and the public sectors.

Let us leave out for a moment the right to strike and the essential service argument. In the rest of the public sector, what aspects are there which should de-limit a public service worker from the due exercise of collective bargaining as compared to anyone who is organized in the private sector?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me read from the material that was prepared for my use in the committee; and I will read from it now. It says with respect to section 17(1):

> It is a universally accepted principle in labour-management relations that the employer has a responsibility to manage. Whatever the nature of the operation might be, collective agreements invariably contain a clause which lists those matters which are reserved exclusively to the employer and, in addition, it is generally accepted by boards of arbitration that there are certain residual rights of management whether or not these matters are spelled out in the agreement. In private sector bargaining, management rights clauses are usually hammered out in the very first agreement between the parties—

Mr. Deans: Why don't you do that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I'll come to that in a moment.

Mr. Deans: I thought you might.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: To continue:

—and in many instances they are continued year after year without so much as changing a comma. The reason they continue without change is that both parties realize that the employer will shut down his operation rather than give up his basic right to manage.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, what a lot of rot? Who wrote that?

Mr. Deans: Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It really doesn't matter, Mr. Chairman. These are opinions that I share. I'm putting my opinions on the record now—

Mr. Lewis: Good!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —as the opposition members have put their opinions on the record.

Mr. Martel: The president of Noranda Mines must have written that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In the public sector, the employer cannot shut his operation down to ensure—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —he retains the right to manage; he cannot do that. The private sector can; if it is prepared to shut down and forego some profits, that is fine; it can elect to make that choice and shut down. But in the public sector, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, the employer cannot shut down his operation for very good and sufficient reasons. First of all, he cannot do this to ensure that he retains the right to manage, let's put it that way; nor should he evade his responsibility to the public and rely on an arbitration board to protect his right to manage.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I'm going to depart from this text and maybe come back to it in a moment.

It was said repeatedly in committee to those who were there, and they will recall it, that the Crown or the Lieutenant Governor in Council has gone a very long way in this legislation to assign certain rights and responsibilities to a third party. That is the specific reason why these various items of management, these management sections or clauses or whatever they may be called, have been set out, because the government does not feel it can assign the determination as to what are management rights to a third party.

Mr. Deans: Don't you trust the arbitration process?

Mr. Lewis: It is all right to set out the employees' rights.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, do you trust the—

Mr. Deans: The employees' rights can always go to arbitration, but don't put management's rights to a third party determination.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about a statute here, we are talking about an Act.

Mr. Deans: That is right. That is why I say it is wrong.

Mr. Lewis: We are talking about a contract.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are talking about a form of contract, a relationship; yes, you're quite right. But I don't believe we are, or should be, prepared to assign certain rights in this particular field to the determination of a third party. The relinquishing of them at all is a major step forward by the government of Ontario.

Mr. Martel: All loaded in the government's favour.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: To assign them for determination purposes to another party is something that I do not think should be done. You may say a government, indeed the Legislature as a whole, that is truly living up to the responsibility placed on it by the public has only one course of action open to it, that is, to ensure by legislation that it will continue to have the right to manage its programmes. That is why these management rights or clauses are set out in the Act under discussion here today.

I'm sorry; I thought somebody was speaking to me. I'm getting a little repetitive here. I don't want to do that, Mr. Chairman, but if we—

Mr. Lewis: You are not getting repetitive—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —believe that the people are entitled to the services of the

province, then I think we have to live up to it in the manner that we are trying to set out in this bill.

Mr. Deans: That is a real red herring.

Mr. Singer: Would the minister explain to me, so I could understand, the difference between the phrases "the methods of effecting promotions" and "the principles and standards governing promotions." One you can talk about and the other one you can't talk about. I think they are exactly the same thing. In section 6 you say you can talk about it and in section 17 you say you can't.

Even in the normal usage of the English language, surely you can't let the wording stay as it is in sections 6 and 17.

Mr. Deans: The one is used in order to offset the other.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would find it difficult to put a specific interpretation on the words "principles" and "standards," but they are there; and they are always there and they—

Mr. Deans: Why don't you send it to arbitration?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —are developed from time to time. Presumably they are flexible and they change; so to put a total appellation on them at any one point in time would be very difficult for me, Mr. Chairman, but nevertheless they are there.

All right; taking that, then, for granted, as spelled out in the Act, we do believe that the methods of living up to those principles and those spelled-out management rights is something that requires specific attention; and that is why they are set out in section 6. This prompted me to say before, and I say again, you cannot separate the two sections in that context. The methods of achieving everything that is set out in section 6—and we have amended it—

Mr. Lewis: It is a terrible section.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —to protect the generality of it; let's put it that way

Mr. Martel: The minister knows it is a terrible section

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It's all spelled out there. Where there are grievable situations, we do protect the employee; but nevertheless, the fundamental principles and the standards must be enshrined somewhere. I'm not conversant enough to say specifically what the principles and standards are, because they are broad; they are not specific, although the specific are there too.

Those principles and standards will change from time to time. They will be added to.

Mr. Martel: How can that be under this?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They will be fleshed out, they will change.

Mr. Martel: Negotiate it; how can you negotiate the principle?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think we're entitled to expect that a statute when it is being written, and it is being written now by a positive action of this Legislature, should be clear and should be able to be easily interpreted.

When, again, I looked at just those two phrases, and those are perhaps as obvious phrases as I can see in the two sections, I can see all sorts of difficulty. We start bargaining under section 6 and they come in and say: "All right, the methods of effecting promotions relate to ability, relate to time at work, relate to degree of education, and so on"; and then you turn over to section 17 and you say: "You can't talk about the principles and standards governing promotion." Surely, that is exactly the same thing. It has to be exactly the same thing.

So depending on the whim of the bargainer that day you might listen to an argument relating to educational qualifications, time on the job, skills, that sort of thing. But if the bargainer has a bad day, he says: "Oh, look at 17; you can't talk about principles and standards." Surely the minister must follow that with me; and surely, at this point, remove at least that anomaly to indicate that what you are giving in section 6 you are not taking away in section 17. I think that makes good sense.

The English language has a variety of meanings, but here you are using easily understood words. In one section you say yes you can do it, section 6; and in section 17 you say no you can't do it. Now why should we burden all these civil servants—what, 70,000 of them—with that immediate anomaly about the most important factor affecting their employment.

I appeal to the minister as a reasonable person, he says he is reasonable sometimes, just look again at those words and tell me what the difference is!

He hasn't explained it. I listened to his words very carefully. He hasn't explained it

in that writing that is before him and he hasn't explained by himself. In fact, he was frank enough to say he isn't sure he can draw the distinction. Well, if at this stage he is not sure he can draw the distinction, how does he expect anybody from here on in to draw the distinction?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to support the amendment by the member for Wentworth, and I think, with the wisdom of the House, the amendment should be carried, giving the minister an opportunity to make some adjustments in relation to this kind of a clause.

The minister did say that this is new legislation and one can't really say what will happen to a section of that type until we have had some experience with it. But what concerns me, and should concern anyone that has any interest in labour relations in the province, is the retrograde thinking that is provided in that section.

The minister quoted recommendations and thoughts of His Honour Judge Little. He also read from a document of officers, who I take it were drafting the legislation; but he never referred to the Freedman report on management's risidual rights, one of the reports that was considered most important in bringing about a better degree of harmonious relations in the labour-management field, and it was based strictly on the subject of section 17.

The minister hasn't used the term technological improvements. He has used "methods," "complement" and "equipment." Complement means the work force; one of the subjects that Freedman dealt with because of the wildcat strike in the CNR because of the Nakina run-through situation. And his report came down simply that there must be provided in collective agreements the rights for the employees to bargain for all conditions of employment; those of technological improvements that would avoid wildcat strikes in between the start and termination of an agreement.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well of course!

Mr. Lewis: No; no sir!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly!

Mr. Lewis: Well you are just treating it as though you were an employer coming to your employee for the first time.

Mr. Gisborn: These are the points that have to be given attention. The complement is the work force, and nowhere can there be more discontent in the employee's eyes than if the work becomes too onerous; if you cut back employees and they have to do more work. You haven't provided for a CWS or a job classification in workload procedures that gives them any right. You haven't said in the arbitration procedures if they can deal with work methods to complement the work force. You haven't even given them the right under arbitration, never mind to collectively bargain when the agreement is open at each term, which they should have.

At least if you were going to follow through with that thinking you should have said at the end, "But there is nothing that will bar the employees from bargaining in the field of technological improvements, work methods and complement at the time the agreement is open;" and then provide provisions in arbitration to have them cleared up.

There are no rights at all for the employee in regard to these clauses. You use the word equipment in there. I ask the minister—he might nod his head in affirmation—if the civil service employees are covered under the Industrial Safety Act?

An hon. member: It's quite clearly stated.

Mr. Gisborn: I would think not. I would think they are not covered under the Industrial Safety Act, because that covers just an industrial manufacturing plant. What happens if your employees are concerned about the type of equipment they are using, whether it is safe or not safe? They are then just at the whim of the foreman, as we were before we had any safety Acts providing for construction safety or industrial safety.

But this is the question. The minister should read the Freedman report and implement the principle entailed in the Freedman report into a section such as this; that gives them the right to bargain for all of these things at the time they are bargaining for a collective agreement, for whatever term it might be, and also providing for these problems to be dealt with by the arbitrator in case of arbitration.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Is the hon. member saying that complement is something that should be bargained for?

Mr. Deans: Yes; definitely!

Mr. Lewis: Sure!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How many people are required to do the job?

Mr. Deans: Definitely, absolutely; for safety purposes!

Mr. Gisborn: That's right.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman: Safety periods, where they are the simple exercise of the employee! You have a view of labour relations in this government that was discarded by some of the most fossilized sections of the private sector years ago.

You would be very hard pressed to find, in the area of industrial unions—perhaps it's more easily found in the area of the building trades unions—but in the industrial union area, where there has been sophisticated collective bargaining for a number of years, you would be hard pressed to find the kind of attitudes which the minister is expressing this afternoon.

With great respect, Mr. Chairman, it is as though you have just inherited the civil service. It is as though, in the most patronizing of ways, you have to indicate to them what is good for them in terms of their employee rights. It is as though you couldn't trust them to carve out areas of authority which the Management Board must manage.

The zeal, the willingness, the enthusiasm with which you consign employee rights to arbitration is in no sense matched by the way in which you are willing to assign management rights to arbitration; and to leave to the employee the mileage rate payable for miles travelled; to leave to the employee the methods of effecting promotions, demotions and transfers. You know what that means; you don't have to play games with the member for Downsview. That means how it's posted. Right! When it goes on the bulletin board! How many days it stays! Whether seniority clauses are acknowledged in the hiring of people after they have seen the posting!

As though that's some kind of concession to the employees. I presume they were doing that 65 years ago in some sectors of the economy.

But in terms of real matters around promotion, demotion or hiring; in terms of real matters around tenure; in terms of what the employee might have to say about his or her definition of the job and the way in which the work place might be organized; that you have excluded, entirely.

Nobody over here is asking you for the equivalent of industrial democracy. Nobody over here is saying that here are identical and equal rights on every front. We are saying that there is not a thing which shouldn't be negotiable; and that at least you can refer the management prerogative to arbitration as well as your willingness to refer all of the employee prerogatives, or many of the employee prerogatives to arbitration.

It is very hard, Mr. Chairman, to know how to deal with the minister or the government under these circumstances. They've dug in their heels with such intransigence. But it is really, Mr. Minister, a pathetic little clause, No. 6. The way in which you have circumscribed the bargaining rights of your Crown employees is really something to behold; and if their own association acquiesces in that, more is the pity. But that doesn't mean that we on this side of the House have to acquiesce in that; and my colleague from Wentworth is entirely right. The whole section should be struck. That whole section should be taken for granted.

Mr. Singer: I said that. He didn't.

Mr. Lewis: Who moved the amendment?

Mr. Deans: I did. I moved the amendment.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but he didn't strike the whole section.

Mr. Lewis: I see. Well, speaking to the amendment, all the words which were struck—

Mr. Singer: That's better.

Mr. Lewis: —after "conditions of employment," so I can respect your virtue; that is the virtue of the member for Downsview, so that Hansard shows it. The motion that clause 6 be amended by deleting all the words after "employment" in the third line; those things should not even have to be listed, Mr. Chairman. They are well recognized as employee rights. It's the things in section 17 that you should be listing as employee rights in the collective bargaining process.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: There is just one point I forgot, Mr. Chairman. In the event this amendment is lost; and the government does seem as though it is not going to support it; I would like to suggest that in his section 2

of section 1—you see he tries to excuse the exclusion by saying the employee has the right to grievance procedure. This should provide for groups of employees, so they can collectively grieve about conditions of work and about work methods. As this now stands, it has to be a grievance by an employee. That change would be a small step toward the Freedman recommendation that, collectively, they can have something to say about those things in a grievance procedure; not just confine it to a single employee grievance procedure.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question then?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I just want to take one moment, and then I hope we'll be ready for the question. Without disclosing the nature of the private sector company, I have before me article 3, management functions, which is part of a private sector agreement.

Mr. Deans: You provide one.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Here is section 1:

> The union acknowledges it is the exclusive function of the company to (a) maintain order, discipline and efficiency; (b) hire, discharge, transfer, classify, promote, demote, layoff, recall and suspend or otherwise discipline employees subject to the right of an employee to lodge a grievance in the manner and to the extent hereinafter provided.

Mr. Deans: Exactly!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Quoting again:

> Make, enforce, and revive from time to time, rules and regulations relating to discipline in the general conduct of employees. (g) generally to manage the enterprise in which the company is engaged, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the right to plan, to act and control operations, direct the work forces; determine the number of personnel required from time to time; the number and location of offices, plants and facilities, services to be performed and the methods, procedures and equipment in connection therewith; determine the products to be manufactured.

And so forth. Now is that a very substantial departure, quite frankly, from what is proposed in sections 6 and 17 of this bill?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, it certainly is.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is not. It is categorically not.

Mr. Lewis: Where is the contract from? What part of the private sector?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is the private sector, I don't think I am at liberty to—

Mr. Lewis: I am not asking the minister for the union local and the name of the company—

Mr. Singer: Why not? What is so secret?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I suppose I could, I am just in a friendly mood. Is it the manufacturing sector? Is it the building trades? Where is it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It could be any one of them probably.

Mr. Lewis: Oh!

Mr. Singer: What is so secret about it?

Mr. Lewis: Well then, the material has no weight. Where does it come from?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am getting the information.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member doesn't have to be quite so loud, I can hear him very well.

Mr. Lewis: The microphones—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That clause was from the manufacturing sector.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Just on a point of procedural clarification: When this amendment comes to a vote I can see that if it is carried, then of course there is no discussion of the sections carried; but should it not be carried, so that the whole section is now here as we have it, do we have an opportunity at that point to put in further amendments with respect to the entire rest of the wording?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Chairman: In other words, the amendment is lost, the section is carried. Section 6 would be carried in its entirety.

Mr. Deans: The amendment wouldn't be lost.

Mr. Bounsall: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to the amendment; it doesn't make much sense should the first amendment carry, but the amendment is that clause 6 be further amended by adding the words, "conditions or changes in conditions affecting continuation or security of employment," after the words, "income protection insurance"; and by adding the word "superannuation"—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bounsall: I have it written out.

Mr. Chairman: It seems to me that what you are talking about is a hypothetical situation in case something happens; and that is not a proper amendment.

Mr. Bounsall: That was my point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: No, it is not a proper sub-amendment in my opinion. We have before us just this amendment, unless the amendment is to be changed in any way.

Mr. Martel: Is the minister going against the lawyers and doctors in this arbitrary fashion?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No!

Mr. Bounsall: Well, we are in a bit of a box here, Mr. Chairman. I won't introduce the amendment—

Mr. Chairman: No, if the amendment should carry—

Mr. Bounsall: If the amendment carries and there is nothing else in the section to amend—

Mr. Chairman: No, if the amendment should carry, then there would be opportunity, I am advised, that the amended section could be further amended.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Renwick: You don't have to amend it.

Mr. Bounsall: If it carries you wouldn't have to amend it.

Mr. Chairman: If the amendment is lost, it automatically carries the section. What the member is talking about is a hypothetical situation which we can't really place.

Mr. Renwick: You just have to test the substance of the point.

Mr. Lewis: You are just applying arbitrary closure and asking the members to discuss it.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman, I will make the point in any event.

Mr. Chairman: If it is in relation to this amendment, you may make your point.

Mr. Lewis: Of course it is.

Mr. Martel: It is right on.

Mr. Bounsall: As it stands, unless this amendment is carried, then you don't have in section 6 any provision which protects the employees against the letting out of work from their various departments. By having some clause in it which allows them to bargain for continuation or factors affecting continuation or the security of employment, it would allow them to bargain about and have a say in the amount of contracting out, if any, within the various work areas which the government might decide upon. This was the force of the one amendment, and of course the other one was to most assuredly get superannuation in this clause 6 as an amendment.

There is a way—and no doubt someone will move that amendment when we get to it in clause 17—a way to get superannuation on the bargaining table, and that is to delete it from clause 17 rather than put it in here exclusively. Because, as I read section 6, what it does here is it refers to subsection 17 as being exclusive, but without limiting that generality indicates, as an example, the rest. So if superannuation is removed from 17 when we get there, I think that serves the same purpose as inserting it here.

In the area of superannuation it seems extremely difficult in this day and age to have a contract with any group of employees in which they can't talk about their pension funds. A group of employees may well decide that their entire raise, for example, should come in the form of improved pension benefits or some improved portability.

In point of fact, I see no reason why employees cannot bargain. I believe that in some areas they in effect reached a situation where they partially had the right over the investment of a portion of their pension funds, particularly in those areas where there is concern over housing and the employees want to use their own pension money to help provide low-interest loans for housing.

This whole matter is an area of great interest to employees and most certainly should be part of the bargaining rights of the employee. But we'll get at the superannuation one; I don't know how we are going to get at the security and continuation of employment through section 17, but when we get there we'll get at the superannuation one, I suppose, by moving deletion under that point.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that unless the amendment is carried, and it would appear to be less than certain that it will carry—

Mr. Reid: That's a pretty safe assumption.

Mr. Renwick: I would like to ask the minister specifically what protection the employees of the government of the Province of Ontario have against decisions made by management to contract out large areas of work now performed by members of the civil service?

I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that in what is now known as the Ministry of Government Services, a substantial number of prospective positions did not appear, which always means that there is an opportunity for promotion, because of the decision by the government that they would contract out large areas of service and other maintenance requirements.

It doesn't take anyone with too much perspicacity to know very well that in the next short while there is likely to be substantial technological change as well in the area of transcribing secretarial work. That is going to affect an immense number of people who are employed in the performance of stenographic service throughout the civil service in the Province of Ontario.

I ask the minister what protection of any kind will it be possible for the employees of the government of Ontario to negotiate in order to protect themselves in their employment during periods of transition to advanced forms of technological machinery and equipment.

On those two points I think the minister has got to answer the question: Where are the employees' rights in the protection of the security of their jobs under this bill?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I guess, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that the employee's rights are virtually everywhere in the bill except where they are excluded.

Mr. Deans: Except where they are needed!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Except where they are excluded! I wouldn't know how to answer the question any better than that, quite frankly.

The analogy drawn by the hon. member is not a new one. I can recall 10 or 12 years ago going through a round of debates here for weeks on end in terms of automation—

Mr. Deans: We are just starting another.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And I can recall the caucus, which was somewhat smaller in numbers then, engaging themselves very mightily and very lengthily in matters that might arise from automation. Well, of course, automation is here to a very considerable extent and the problems have not been as inherent as one might have expected 10 years ago.

Mr. Deans: The problems have all arisen.

Mr. Martel: Except you have several thousand people unemployed.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: So I don't know that I can find a categorical answer to the hon. member's question, other than to say that if that situation arises it probably will be dealt with in the same reasonable, fair manner that everything else has been dealt with by the government of this province.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And whether we have things spelled out in a statute or not to protect the rights of employers and employees is to a very considerable extent beside the point, as long as the relationship that exists today exists in the future; and I have no reason to believe it won't.

I have said before, and I say now—and this is perhaps more general than specific as far as the hon. member's question is concerned—I have an abiding concern for the public that the government serves; and in the performance of those responsibilities, I do not believe that it needs to negate the principal rights of the employees. It never has and I'm not in any way contemplating saying to you today that it ever will. But these things have to be enshrined in a statute, in the opinion of the government and of myself, and I have heard nothing this afternoon that would prompt me to recommend any amendments.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You decided that weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I am surprised by the minister, with his vast knowledge of handling this type of problem over the years. I'm not as learned in these affairs as many on my left, but it would seem to me that the principle involved in section 17 emasculates the very precious principle of collective bargaining.

Mr. Chairman: We are on section 6.

Mr. Sargent: I know, Mr. Chairman, but we mentioned section 17 in discussing section 6; one bears upon the other. I would say that—

Mr. Chairman: We are really discussing the amendment to section 6.

Mr. Sargent: I know, sir, but I would say that it shows clearly the policy of the government in areas in which they have control as well as their policy in this area in the rest of the province and in every other area where unions are concerned. I think it is a vicious piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question then?

All those in favour of Mr. Deans' motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Shall we stack this along with other possible votes? No stacking?

Call in the members.

The committee divided on the amendment which was negatived.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 30, the "nays" are 48.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and that section 6 stands as part of the bill.

Any comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill up to section 10? All right; carried up to section 10.

Up to section 15? The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Yes, thank you. I have a lot of difficulty with section 11. Quite frankly, I don't see why it is that we have to set out in legislation—

An hon. member: Don't go too far away!

Mr. Deans: —the matters that any board will take into consideration. I object to the way this is worded.

> In the conduct of proceedings before it and in rendering a decision in respect of a matter in dispute, the board shall consider any factor that to it appears to be relevant to the matter in dispute including [and then we set them out] the needs of the Crown and its agencies . . . the conditions of employment in similar occupations—

Why is it that you can't leave it up to the common sense of the board members who are appointed to deal with the matter appropriately? Why is it that you can't allow the board to sit and to make its own judgement based on the evidence as presented to it? Why do you feel it is necessary to direct the board in the things that it will consider to be important?

It makes no sense to me that the government should set out in legislation all of the matters that the government considers are important to the rendering of a decision. Why can't it simply set out in such a way as to say that in the conduct of proceedings before it and in rendering a decision in respect of a matter in dispute, the board shall consider any factors that appear to be relevant—and leave it at that.

Why can't you trust the judgement of the people who are put on the board? You are going to set two of them there in any event. And surely the people that the government appoints to the board are going to understand what the government philosophy is. They are certainly not going to get appointed if they don't.

Surely it makes sense that they should be permitted to sit unimpeded by any government direction or directive, to listen to the evidence presented that has bearing on the case that is appearing before it, and to make a decision.

I totally disagree with setting out in statute form this kind of itemizing of the things which the board shall consider to be important in any matter that appears before them for adjudication. I think it's another evidence of the government's fear of its employees and its inability to understand the responsiveness and sense of responsibility that other people have toward the operations of the Province of Ontario as well as the other people who will be appointed as members of the board

The people who will be members of the board will deal in good faith; they won't have to be directed by statute. You simply say to them, "There is a hearing before you. You have been appointed by us to represent one side of the argument"; as is the case in

any event. They will listen carefully to the evidence and they will make their judgement based on what they hear.

I say to you that in actual fact that particular section should stop at the word "relevant" in the third line of subsection 2 of section 11. I think it's totally wrong that the government should exercise this kind of directive power over any supposedly impartial body sitting in judgement on any matter. They should take into consideration those things which they consider to be relevant and no other things, and they should not be dictated to by this government or anyone else.

An hon. member: Right, right!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think a reading of the section again would indicate to the hon. member that they are not being dictated to. There are four subsections set out here, I suppose, for directional purposes. This is—

Mr. Deans: For direction, that is right.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —new legislation; it's pioneering. You can call it, breaking new ground—

Mr. Lewis: Pioneering!

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —all you like! But really, can the hon. member say what difference it really makes? Does it make any difference that four particular situations are set out?

Subsection (2), as the hon. member says, refers to "any factor that to it appears to be relevant." Now, do the four subsections under that change the basic relevancy of the Act?

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No—

Mr. Deans: Yes, because it says—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —because it can be anything else.

Mr. Deans: —these must be included.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That's right, "relevant to the matter in dispute including . . . "; all right! That doesn't detract from the relevance of—

Mr. Deans: No; why must you direct? Why can't you leave it up to the board to make decisions based on the evidence and nothing else?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I don't know that that has a bearing on the situation at all, Mr. Chairman. It's going to be a new piece of legislation with a new board, a new tribunal for matters arising from the Act itself. We think it is quite relevant to put those four in; it expands the relevancy of the section.

Mr. Chairman: Has anyone else got any comments up to 15?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the effect of listing those four clauses in section 11, subsection (2), is to say to the arbitration board: "Look gentlemen, you're handling this with the government's needs as the prior needs and you make pretty sure that you understand it, because we are setting these things out in order to impart to you the kind of tone that we want followed. And in case you haven't got the message from all the other discriminatory and exclusive sections of this Act, we are now setting out yet another series of strictures, within which strictures you must work in the arbitration process."

The strictures may be fairly neutral in themselves and they may not seem to trigger any particular anxiety, except they serve as a clear warning to the arbitration proceedings, that it's the needs of the Crown which are paramount and that this section simply underlies, once again, the other prohibitions that are contained in the report.

In that sense it is a perfectly gratuitous section. It's a section which simply serves to reinforce the inequality of the collective bargaining process enshrined in this Act. It's a section which gives yet greater weight to the Crown side simply by being there—simply by saying to the board: "We haven't enough faith in your independence, your integrity and your capacity to say to you, "The board shall examine into and decide on matters that are in dispute within the scope of collective bargaining under this Act," and leave it at that."

Who are you going to appoint to the arbitration board? Who are you going to make the arbitrators? People of no wisdom? People of no insight? People of no common sense? People without experience?

What do you have to lay down these guidelines for, except to imply to them, in no uncertain terms, that they had better understand the rules of the game? And the rules of the game are that the Crown shall be

served first and the employees shall be served, if possible.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we will oppose clause 11 in this Act; as a matter of fact, you don't even need the first subsection of clause 11. Once you have got an arbitration board, it's clear that they examine those things that are in dispute within the scope of collective bargaining. What you are setting out here is a redundancy to serve your case, and it would be perfectly legitimate to oppose the entire clause; and so we will do, Mr. Chairman, though not to divide the House.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 11 stand as part of the bill?

Some hon. members: No!

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of section 11 standing as part of the bill, will please say "aye."

All those opposing will say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Gisborn: On section 15, Mr. Chairman, unless there are any members who want to raise questions on 13 or 14? I would like—yes, it is 15, Mr. Chairman: "The parties to a collective agreement may provide for the payment by the employees of dues or contributions to the employee organization."

I would like the minister to explain what procedures are going to be followed to establish what is termed the union dues section. It it obvious that it is not going to be a closed shop provision. It is obvious that it is not going to be a union shop provision. It doesn't spell out whether or not it is going to be a membership maintenance provision. It doesn't spell out how the Crown will be authorized to deduct the dues, and there is no indication that the Lieutenant Governor will make regulations to provide such. I can find no indication as to the irrevocable part or the revocable part of union dues. Could the minister explain just what this section is going to cover?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The section was amended in committee, as will be noted, principally because the bargaining agents were concerned that a checkoff arrangement which they might negotiate could be negated by changing the regulations. As the hon. member has pointed out, there is no need for regulations now. There is no need—that's the amendment.

Mr. Gisborn: The only reference that this Act makes to the dues which will be paid by an employee is in 15: "The parties to a collective agreement may provide for the payment by the employees of dues or contributions to the employee organization." Surely we can't leave it at that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Subsection (1)—is that what you are speaking of now? Subsection (1) of 15?

Mr. Gisborn; Section 15; subsection (1) of section 15. That is the only portion which refers to the collecting of dues.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Correct!

Mr. Gisborn: It says they may make a collective agreement. Is it possible for the arbitration board to say, "We will not entertain any method of collecting dues for the members of your organization."? Where is the union security? Where is the union security for the Civil Service Association in this Act?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am afraid you have lost me. The section reads, "The parties to a collective agreement may provide for the payment by the employees of dues or contributions to the employee organization."

Subsection 2 sets out certain conditions under which the employee may not be required to pay; otherwise there is the same situation that exists today whether or not they are members of the union—it does not negate the payment of dues. Everybody pays other than those who were not paying dues up to about nine years ago—they are not involved—but from that point on, every employee pays dues whether or not he is a member of the union; unless he opts for certain matters in subsection (2) of 15.

Mr. Gisborn: It is a funny situation as far as I am concerned. The Act should provide that when the dues are established by the association—not by the board, by the association—they submit that dues agreement to the union itself, that they have agreed as a union to pay a certain number of dollars per month for dues. The Act should say that this government will collect it for them and forthwith send it to the union, the Civil Service Association of Ontario. That should be in there because it says they may set them. Suppose the board says, "There is no provision for us to collect your dues for you." How do they manage it now? Do you collect the dues for them?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Gisborn: There is nothing here that says that will continue. This is a new Act, as you have said. It is a pretty weak section. They have no union security whatsoever; union security in the collection of dues to run the organization.

Mr. Martel: Would you like to put an amendment in?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Lewis: How do you answer it? How do you answer the point?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I point out that, as I would understand it, subsection 1 is also supported by subsection 2 because there are situations where dues are not required to be paid; they are spelled out in subsection 2. Religious grounds is one, if you wish.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But that is permissive too.

Mr. Gisborn: That is after the fact, though; after the dues section is clarified by a board under collective agreement. But nothing prevails at this point. You don't say in here that you will collect the dues for them, once they have established the dues rate, as in other agreements. Most agreements say the company will collect the dues as submitted to the employer; they will collect it and forthwith forward it to the union.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes; but, Mr. Chairman, the agreements will hopefully indicate that the union wants the dues checked off. That, as I say, has been going on for nine years.

Mr. Martel: So has everything else.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me put it the other way: The dues will be checked off unless the union doesn't want to include it. The dues will be checked off, not only from the members of the bargaining agent but from those who are not. Here, of course, I have reference to the Rand formula, which we are all familiar with.

Mr. Gisborn: What the minister is saying then is that in this process of collective bargaining, they will establish their dues rate, then the board has to agree to check it off. If the union says it wants an irrevocable dues checkoff system, will that follow? Or will it be denied?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The purport of the Act, I believe, is that that would be dealt with in every collective agreement.

Mr. Gisborn: Then there is a chance that the board will allow, under some direction from the government, an irrevocable check-off of union dues. That means that a member can fluctuate each month; if he just notifies the management that he no longer wants to be a member of the union, then they stop checking it off for the union.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No. I have already explained, and I repeat, that whether they are a member of the union or not, their dues are checked off. The dues of every employee in the public service, other than those who were not included up until about nine years ago, are now checked off—and that will continue. The agreement will provide for that.

Mr. Gisborn: I understand that, Mr. Chairman, but we have here an Act to Provide for Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees, and all we have got is a section 15: "The parties to a collective agreement may provide for the payment by the employees of dues or contributions to the employee organization."

What I am saying is that they have to negotiate the terms of that union security clause, and then that will be implied in their collective agreement. But we don't know whether they will get it or not. It has to be negotiated and, in the final instance, it is left to a board to decide, unless they agree to the type of union security the union is asking for.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I repeat, for what I hope will be the purpose of clarity: The agreement will provide for the collection of dues unless the union particularly does not want it that way.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 15 carry?

Mr. Deans: Now wait a minute.

Mr. Singer: I want to speak too, Mr. Chairman. If we are through with section 15(1), I want to talk about section 15(2).

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How you can prescribe in an Act what must not be put into an agreement? I think we have to prescribe what can be put into an agreement.

Mr. Deans: No. I think you just leave it open—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): That is not bargaining.

Mr. Deans: —if you want to know the truth.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I don't think there is any material difference, if we are not going to put in prohibitive clauses in this particular area as to what cannot be included in the agreement.

Mr. Gisborn: But I think it is fair to say that the management will collect the dollars as dues as decided by the organization and forwarded to their secretary-treasurer. It doesn't say that. There is no guarantee here that will take place.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, there is.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Are we through with section 15(1)? I want to address myself to section 15(2).

Mr. Chairman: We are still on section 15.

Mr. Singer: Well, so far as section 15(2) is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I wonder why the phraseology is permissive rather than mandatory. I thought we had already established that where, because of religious convictions, an employee objected to paying dues out of contributions, certain things follow. Now you allow the tribunal in its discretion to give relief.

Surely the intention and the practice has already been established; that it is mandatory where such a situation exists. Should there be a continuing discretion, that the tribunal can now replace the decision that's been made by government on this same question in other legislation? The wording says: "Where the tribunal is satisfied," then the tribunal "may" make such an order. Now, once they've been satisfied that it's a bona fide objection, surely that should be the only test.

In other words, what I'm suggesting to the minister, is having said: "Where the tribunal is satisfied," they put their discretion to it—that's the first line at the top of page 11. The tribunal has to satisfy themselves that the objection is a bona fide one and that the person has genuine religious beliefs along these lines; then shouldn't the section go on to say that they shall order, and that the word "may" the last word in line three should be changed to the word "shall"?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, how would you equate that with subsection 6, then: "No collective agreement shall contain a provision which would require, as a condition of employment, membership in the employee organization." How would you equate those two?

Mr. Haggerty: Remove sections 6 and 17 as written into the Act.

Mr. Singer: Well, this is not making them members of the organization. This is saying that where there is the compulsory checkoff and people with genuine religious convictions object to the compulsory checkoff going to the union funds, then they have this option. Now your first line of sub 2 says, where the tribunal is "satisfied" that the person has this genuine kind of an objection, then the tribunal "may;" so there are their two tests.

I don't think there should be. I think the test is that they be satisfied that it is a genuine objection; and once they are satisfied, then they shall make such an order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You're speaking about section 15, subsection 2 again, line three after the word "tribunal"?

Mr. Singer: Yes, the word should be "shall," instead of "may."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I shall accept that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Thank you. I so move; or the minister can move it; I don't care.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I was about to, if that's all right. Did you think I wouldn't?

Mr. Singer: All right; go ahead.

Mr. Chairman: The word shall be substituted in section 2, the second line.

Mr. Singer: Line three, the last word!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: After the word "tribunal."

Mr. Chairman: "Shall" for "may;" is this acceptable?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: "May" shall be changed to "shall." Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Section 15 carried? Does anyone wish to comment from 16 to 19?

Mr. Lewis: It just shows the power of the legislative process, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: Section 17, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: 17?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This isn't a tooth-and-nail section.

Mr. Deans: No. Which one?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This section.

Mr. Lewis: You like that tooth and nail, eh? What about tooth by jowl?

Mr. Deans: I want to ask the minister if he would be kind enough to explain to me what this all means. I've read it very carefully and I'm not at all clear just exactly what it is that you're holding to yourself, in terms of—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I forgot—

Mr. Deans: Section 17.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Section 17, all right.

Mr. Deans: Okay?

> The right to determine employment, appointment, complement, organization, work methods and procedures, kinds and location of equipment, discipline and termination of employment, assignment, classification, job evaluation system, merit system, training and development.

And so on and so on; and we'll get to the "superannuation" in a moment. What is it about all of those things that they are so important to the government—

Mr. Haggerty: Promotions based on ability and the seniority of the union.

Mr. Deans: —that they will refuse to permit them to be discussed between the employer and the employee at the time of negotiation? What is it about the discussion of the "complement," for example, of persons necessary on a particular job that requires it to be the sole jurisdiction of management. Why should not the number of persons required on a particular job for safety purposes be negotiable between the employee and management to begin with? Why should it not be a matter that can be raised over a negotiating table and settled by arbitration? Assuming that the government's position is correct and management's position is correct in this instance, then they have nothing to fear by the arbitration process.

They say the arbitration process is the panacea; it solves all of the problems and everyone is going to be subjected to it. So, if that is the case and if, in fact, it is going to be used throughout the civil service to settle every single matter that affects their day-to-day existence, then why should the government fear sending to arbitration matters such as the determination of the complement of persons required to do a particular function?

What is so holy about that, that it can't be discussed—the kinds and location of equipment? Surely to goodness if the employees feel there is safer equipment available and they are suffering some injury from the equipment that is being used, they should have the right to raise those matters during negotiations. I ask you what is it about the kinds and location of equipment that is so important that it must be held to the bosom of management and can't be discussed with the employee?

What about discussions centring on discipline and termination of employment? Surely it is the right of the employees' association and their representatives to discuss with management at negotiation time clauses dealing with the method of discipline, the application of discipline and the times and appropriateness of particular cases of termination of employment, and the effect that they will have on the day-to-day operations of the employees within their jurisdiction. Or what about job classification? Surely there is nothing so important about job classification that management will not discuss them with the employees.

One of the most important items is the whole matter of superannuation. Why, pray tell, is it that management refuses to discuss the superannuation programme with its employees, the people who obviously either benefit or do not benefit from the kind of programme the government puts into effect. What possible difference can it make? If you believe the arbitration system works so well, and if you believe that it is the answer to the labour relations problems that we have had in the Province of Ontario, as has been stated by any number of your members, then why are you afraid to allow any dispute between your employees and the government to go to an arbitration board for discussion and decision on a matter such as superannuation, which affects the entire lifestyle of an employee after retirement?

Surely, he or she should have some right to sit down and discuss this matter with the employer and to come to some satisfactory arrangement as to the way in which it would be applied and the kinds of investment that might be made and the way in which they

can derive the best possible return for the moneys that are used. It strikes me as extremely odd that the government would hold the position that it does in this particular matter.

As for the whole matter of standards governing promotion, demotion, transfer, layoff, surely it is within the rights of any employee organization to bargain the standards and application of layoff clauses, the standards as well as the way they are applied. Let's face it, you can only apply the layoff clause in accordance with the standards that are set. If they don't have any rights to determine the standards, or at least to discuss and negotiate the standards, then it seems to me that you are refusing them basic rights, basic rights in the negotiating process, basic rights in the determining of what kind of a plant the work place will be as far as their particular employment is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I realize it is 5 o'clock and I have considerably more to say on this section. I wonder if you want to move to private members' hour.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells moves that the committee rise and report.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress on Bill 105 and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps before we proceed I might be permitted just a few seconds to inform the hon. members that we have a special visitor with us in the Speaker's gallery, the Hon. W. M. Campbell, MLC, who is the member for East Yarra from Melbourne, Australia, and Mrs. Campbell.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR:

TORONTO URBAN FOUNDATION

Mrs. Scrivener moves second reading of Bill 9, An Act to establish the Toronto Urban Foundation.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to introduce the Toronto Urban Foundation Act, 1972, to this House for examination and debate.

Ever since man emerged from the stone age, he has sought to organize his activities and daily living habits in a form that would lessen conflict between himself and other people. We call this organizational form "the community."

When our ancestors learned to make better weapons and tools, by grinding and polishing them; when man learned how to raise food—cereals, fruit and vegetables—and how to tame animals, he parted from the earlier stone age where he had lived by hunting, fishing, and chipping stone.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He also learned to make war rather deftly, you will recall.

Mrs. Scrivener: The new discoveries led to great change in man's way of life. He was no longer a nomad. He began to settle down to cultivate barley, wheat, grapes and olives. He became more certain of his food supply, and population increased. The means of making pottery and cloth was discovered. The wheel was invented and man began to understand the need for laws and for government.

From these earliest times, Mr. Speaker, came the settled communities in the valley of the Nile River, where man emerged from a primitive state to create the beginning of world civilization.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Is this in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mrs. Scrivener: About 4000 to 3000 BC came the Sumerians, who are generally considered by most historians as the world's first settlers, and they drained the marshes, dug ditches and built canals to irrigate their farms.

Later, large, well-organized communities, each of them independent of the others, were developed. At the centre of each of these communities was a small town or city. This was of course the city-state form of government which later in history was copied by the Greeks and Romans; Vatican City is an archaic holdover from this form.

All of this reflects change and progress in the history of man, but change in the context of an urban environment cannot be limited to technology alone. We need to express greater interest in all of the problems of the present metropolis or future megalopolis.

The purpose of this bill is to establish a foundation to study the sociological and psychological effects of urban living upon residents of Metropolitan Toronto and to assist in the long-range planning of urban areas in Ontario.

Although my remarks apply directly to Metropolitan Toronto, actually they are applicable to almost any one of the 40 major

urban centres on the North American continent.

In considering the future growth and development of this metropolis we call Metropolitan Toronto for the next 30 or 50 years, the questions are raised as to what form and structure the future city will take, what the lifestyle of its citizens will be and whether the base for the total urban structure that we are laying now will be satisfying to those who come after us.

It is natural enough when thinking about a metropolis to turn first to the basic need of technology; that is, transportation, housing and other public services that are required and which make city living possible; in other words, bricks and mortar. But the very virtue of a metropolis is the variety and versatility which in turn constitutes the glamour and excitement and the big city to so many people.

The city is not for everyone but for those who can understand it, can enjoy it and use its amenities fully. However, within this pull between technology on the one hand and attraction on the other, there is one constant factor and that is the pressure for change. Change in the context of an urban environment cannot be limited to technology alone. It must also embrace lifestyle in the broadest sense of that term. Therefore, what concerns me is that, while we focus much attention on the physical plan of a great city—and I appreciate and acknowledge this important need—we do not place enough importance, enough interest, upon the socio-psychological problems of the present metropolis, or, if you will, the future megalopolis.

And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I would remind you that a foremost international planner, Leonidas Doxiadis, predicts that 50 years from now we shall be part of a giant megalopolis stretching roughly from the Atlantic seaboard to Chicago.

However, staying with the concept of the creation of a metropolis—and that is what Metropolitan Toronto is today; it can no longer be classified as a city, it is a metropolis—it is my view that true success and progress can only be measured by paralleling the psychological factor with the technological, for without proper attention to the former we become victims rather than benefactors of the latter.

Now, I know that there already exist planning boards at the local level, and through the recent reorganization of this government of Ontario, we also have the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, and the Department of Urban Affairs at the federal level in Ottawa. These, along with other agencies and various citizens' groups, have made, and are making, various studies about the structure of the city.

The choice of living in a great city is more than an economic factor; it is more than just the drawing-power of greater job opportunities provided by the numbers of head offices and the convenient locations of many industrial plants. Nor is it only because of the greater variety of entertainment available. A great city has a culture of its own, and there are many other intangible qualities accruing to it that are not well understood. Living in a big city is, in fact, a way of life, which many do not wish to give up for the pursuit of a very different kind of existence in rural areas or in some other part of the province or of the country.

Because of this attachment to the metropolis by thousands of people, I believe that we should have a vehicle for continuous study into why people choose this way of life. And once we begin to understand psychologically more about this phenomenon—a phenomenon which is thousands of years old—then we will be better equipped to make city living increasingly attractive, with greater security for our citizens and less loneliness.

We have and are producing blueprints for the creation of the structure. But now we must begin to expand our thinking; we must obtain a view embracing a deeper understanding of the philosophy of city living, so that we can become more fully aware of why people choose to live in a metropolis. And we must learn the answers now. I believe that we can begin to seek these answers by establishing a Toronto Urban Foundation, an organization which would launch wide-ranging studies into the sociological and psychological needs of city people, and from these studies assist Metro to fulfil its role as a great metropolis of the world.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first steps that the foundation should undertake is the establishment of a special task force to assemble as much material as possible that may have already been written on this general subject, and, in effect, to create the nucleus of a central urban affairs reference library that could be made available to our various colleges and universities and students of urban planning courses.

The Toronto Urban Foundation would be supported, not only by necessary professionals but also by citizen residents of the environment to be studied. Such a foundation could

also be a further step toward the involvement of both the individual and the citizen group in helping to make the crucial decisions which will affect the future lives of all of us who live here in this city. I believe that the work and the results of the Toronto Urban Foundation could lead to a new and rewarding philosophy of the city. Such an organization could provide the leadership which would help us to understand and appreciate more fully what are the intangible qualities that attach to the more easily understood visual structures.

For instance Alvin Toffler, in his famous book "Future Shock," wrote, and I quote:

> In the past, permanence was the idea, whether engaged in handcrafting a pair of boots or in constructing a cathedral, all man's creative and productive energies went towards maximizing the durability of the product. Man built to last. He had to. As long as the society around him was relatively unchanging, each object had clearly defined functions and economic logic dictated the policy of permanence. Even if they had to be repaired now and then, the boots that cost $50 and lasted 10 years were less expensive than those that cost $10 and lasted only a year. As the general rate of change in society accelerates, however, the economics of permanence are, and must be, replaced by the economics of transience.

Mr. Speaker, it is this transience, this impermanence which seems to bother so many people in our society today—and has been one of the factors which has led me to introduce this bill.

Change is the inevitable quality in our lives. We start to die the day we are born. That is one of the reasons we seek permanence, roots, status quo as a means of offsetting the changing patterns which we have to accept. Although our cities change, I think we can provide permanence for our citizens through the strength and viability of our communities.

The Ontario Economic Council has recently stated and I quote:

> Community has become one of the overworked cliches of the day. Yet there is much truth in the argument that the old sense of community, the sense of belonging to a group larger than the family, gave our society a foundation that supported the processes of social life. Unchecked population growth and urbanization have effectively destroyed this source of social cohesion. The decline of community, and the gradual but perceptible erosion of religious ties have destroyed the basis for social cohesion.

And John Kenneth Galbraith said in his book, "The New Industrial State":

> The advantages of dealing comprehensively with change are considerable. Those of dealing with change that extend beyond economics are also great and with passage of time, become more so. That is because with improvement in popular well-being, economics become progressively more inadequate as a basis for social judgement and as a guide to public policy.

Mr. Speaker, change in any context can not be considered only in the material sense, but must be linked to the psychological sense as well. Further, in its report released on May 25, entitled "Ontario—A Society in Transition," the Ontario Economic Council said:

> Those measures of social change that we do have, limited as they may be, have not been moving in the direction that we assumed they would. Many social indicators, particularly those relating to crime, drug use, illegitimacy, broken marriages, and mental health, are showing disturbing trends.

And another comment:

> The lack of a consistent philosophical base has been a factor in the relative inability of humanism to have a more profound impact in the marketplace of ideas. Ranged against the humanist, was the materialist concept of economic growth.

Further along in the report, and my last comment, Mr. Speaker:

> The impact of telescoped change presents us with the age-old problem in a new perspective. The rapidity of change forces us to adopt new ways of handling change. For the first time, we must build into our institutions, the mechanism for evolutionary change.
>
> But how, and in what direction should we go? All of us accept the necessity to plan for the future. But what is the shape of that future? Who, in our society, is qualified to formulate societal goals? What institutions now exist in which we can even begin to answer these fundamental questions?

Mr. Speaker, finding answers to question like these being posed by the Ontario Economic Council, is precisely the role that I envisage for the Toronto Urban Foundation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I have known the hon. member for St. David for a number of years, and I happen to like her personally—that's why it's going to make it a little difficult for me to say some of the things that I'm going to say about this bill she's introduced here.

It has a very high-sounding and pretentious title, calling for the establishment of the Toronto Urban Foundation. Now, a foundation implies an organization that is something of a permanent nature, a permanent institution. What it implies and what it connotes in another respect is that it is an institution which is based on an endowment and an investment of money by some wealthy firm, like the Ford Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): From the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

Mr. Givens: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Lewis: He said from the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Givens: Where will the money come from, from what investments will money flow for the financing of this foundation and what will the money be used for and who will be paid and what experts will be hired?

So this really isn't a foundation. I know of no governmental foundation, federal or provincial, either on this side of the border or on the southern side of the border, that is financed by governmental funds. Really, Mr. Speaker, with all the serious things that we have to discuss around here, to discuss this bill right now is really something.

And there is another implication, you know. Ever since we started discussing cities—and urban problems are even being discussed federally now, due to a little bit of work that I did up in the federal government—cities of this country have been examined by telescope and by microscope and by stethoscope and there have been so many reports and so many studies by so many boards and organizations, governmental and private, that if they were laid end to end they would girdle the globe.

The trouble today, Mr. Speaker, is not that there isn't enough information or enough data or enough understanding. The trouble today is that there is no will to take action with respect to the problems that the hon. member for St. David has talked about. If she presented that as an essay in political science 1a at any university I would give her an A for it, but to talk about it here in this crucible of public opinion and this crucible of realism—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: —which the members of this Legislature have—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): A crucible of realism!

Mr. Givens: —of urban affairs, you know, is going a little too far and I don't know why the whips and the House leader would call on this bill to be discussed today, which we in this party oppose.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Givens: You talk about studies. There have been studies done having to do with economics and technology and, indeed, sociology and psychology, by the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities; by the Ontario Federation of Mayors and Reeves; by the Ontario Municipal Association, which is an organization made up of municipal officials; by all the provinces. All the provinces have done studies with respect to what makes their cities tick.

There have been studies made by all universities; there's Lloyd Acksworthy, the professor at the University of Manitoba, who used to be the executive assistant to a former Minister of Transport in charge of housing and urban affairs in the federal government. There have been studies done by Toronto's Bureau of Municipal Research—now there is a name to conjure with. It isn't the Toronto Urban Foundation, but it is the Bureau of Municipal Research, which is financed by private funds and has done good work for many, many years. There is hardly a subject about municipal affairs on which they don't have a tract or a treatise.

Then, up in the federal field; when I got there in 1968, the Prime Minister told me there would never be a Department of Urban Affairs up there, that it was unconstitutional and, "What good are your stinking sewers if we don't have national unity in this country?" He subsequently enlisted a professor by the name of N. H. Lithwick and it cost the taxpayers of this country thousands of dollars to prepare what is referred to as the Lithwick report for the benefit and the edification of the Hon. R. K. Andras,

the minister from the head of the lakes who then became the first Urban Affairs minister, which the Prime Minister said he would never have and never countenance.

The Lithwick report. Lithwick in turn enlisted a task force of fantastic proportions of people from various disciplines and the universities and agencies across this country. It came to thousands and thousands of words and there are many tracts and treatises which you can borrow from the library here which have been circularized by the federal government.

Then there was the Privy Council report; a report dealing with municipal affairs which was asked for by the President of the Privy Council in Ottawa. The Economic Council of Canada and the Economic Council of Ontario have dealt with matters sociological and psychological that have to do with urban affairs.

HUD, in the United States—that is the secretariat of housing and urban development. You send away a letter to Washington, DC, and they will send you a six-foot high pile of tracts and treatises having to do with municipal and urban affairs in the United States. The problems in the cities over there have things very much in common with us.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Not all the time.

Mr. Givens: —that our federal Department of Urban Affairs now—

Mr. Lewis: Make your speech later. The hon. member will have his chance.

Mr. Givens: —has a budget to do with urban affairs and housing. The federal urban research council is in existence; then there's the Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. which has done studies of this kind. Then there's Mr. Hellyer's—

An hon. member: You name it, we got it!

Mr. Givens: —late lamented task force on housing. What do you think that was all about if it didn't have to do with matters having to do with sociological and psychological problems in the field of housing? You know what happened to that poor guy.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. Judging from today's—

Mr. Givens: Just today, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: Hearken unto my words. Just today, Mr. Speaker, there was a booklet on urban problems on my desk which was sent to me by a professor of the University of Waterloo, a fellow by the name of Ralph R. Krueger whose bill we were dealing with the other day. You have an excellent compilation here. I haven't had a chance to read it yet—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: But you can tell from the nature of the people. Several of them are authors from whom the hon. member for St. David quoted. Incidentally, the name is not Leonardo Doxiadis. Leonardo was Leonardo da Vinci. Doxiadis' first name is Constantinos, if you want to make that correction.

Mr. Lewis: On those grounds alone we are opposing the bill.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, there are articles by people like, just to mention these names, Lewis Mumford, Abraham Hoffer, George Bain, James "Scotty" Reston of the New York Times, Hans Blumenfeld, one of the greatest authorities in the world—who, incidentally, was in favour of the Spadina extension even after it had been scuttled by the Premier of this province (Mr. Davis).

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Tell us about that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: Jane Jacobs, who was opposed to the Spadina expressway, has an article here. There is an article by Leonard Gertler of the Gertler report—you have heard of that—and by Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute.

Mr. Lewis: Herman Kahn?

Mr. Givens: That's another name like the foundation.

Mr. Lewis: That is a short course on urban destruction.

Mr. Givens: Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, and I am sorry the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) isn't here, another author, R. Buckminster Fuller. You guessed it right on the nose.

Mr. Lawlor: I knew it was coming.

Mr. Lewis: Right. The only person missing is Henry Kissinger.

Mr. Givens: Incidentally, in this booklet from which I just quoted these authors, there

is an enormous bibliography on the back pages. It must contain at least 150 books to which it guides you and attracts your attention, plus other bibliographies, flowing from the books quoted here. So what do we need further studies for?

I suggest to you, with great respect, when the tri-level conference takes place in November the first thing on the order paper will probably be a research body to be set up by the tri-level governments. Because, after all, what is the most inconsequential and innocuous thing that this tri-level conference can do but determine to establish a research body, so that it can study things for the next four or five or six or seven years so we don't have to take action?

Just today, there was an editorial in the Toronto Star, that very famous Toronto newspaper, headed, "Setting the Standards for a Housing Policy," in which they take to task federal Urban Affairs Minister Ron Basford. They use as the point of departure a treatise published last week by the Canadian Council on Social Development and say that Mr. Basford should incorporate some of its recommendations.

The point I am trying to make, facetiously and otherwise, Mr. Speaker, is that we have loads of material. We have studies and we have information and data coming out of our ears and we don't need any more. Because we have all this information, which governments have refused to act on, I suggest with great respect that this bill has certain insidious implications. It implies that what this government needs, of all governments in this country, is a further study, another study under the aegis of this foundation. However it is going to be constructed and where it will draw its funds from, I don't know. We won't support it; my party won't support it. I think we have enough data. What is lacking on the urban problem in this province and in this country, is action and not further study.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, let me say on behalf of this party that it is with, to say the least, scant enthusiasm that we rise to speak on this bill this afternoon. As a matter of fact in caucus—I had a private caucus of my own in the library a few moments ago—and I decided not to let the House even know what position we were going to take on the matter. We will nevertheless fend with the merits of the legislation.

There are two rather overriding defects right off the cuff, and one has to do with the fact that this urban foundation devolves around and has very little to do with anything else but the city of Toronto. It does make kind of an offhand reference to the utilization by other urban areas in Ontario of what can be learned from the studies in Toronto, but the very fact that it zeros in in this particular way would itself probably place the bill in grave jeopardy.

The other matter that might be mentioned, apart from the provinciality—or the non-provinciality; the bill isn't even provincial in the right sense of the term, nor even parochial I don't think; it is geographically narrow—the second point is that I would have the good member look at the proliferation of Tory boards in the past few years. One may call them by any other name—foundations or otherwise—but in the past 10 years, of the number of new boards and agencies set up in the province—well, once I started to count and I reached 3,000-and-some-odd and I felt that although this is a point that has been made in earlier times, every unemployed Tory in the province was going to find some kind of soft place or easy circumstance if he just stuck around long enough.

On those two grounds the bill outdistances itself.

It might nevertheless be of some merit to set up either one of two institutions to work along the lines suggested by the hon. member —a sociological and psychological study of the city of Toronto. One of them might be a legislative book club, which could meet in the corner on Wednesday afternoons or times like that and discuss the current literature of the day—"Future Shock" and the urbanization and the Krueger report over here — matters which we working legislators have very little opportunity to do.

The second thing that might be suggested, and I would be wholly in favour of this, is that we could set up a select committee of this Legislature to study the major cities of the world. You would spend some time certainly, for instance, in Brasilia, or that new city of Lacabusia on the Brahmaputra. We would have quite a marvellous time. I think we should suspend legislating—

Mr. Lewis: Mumbo jumbo on the Upper Wog. As a matter of fact, to a little town in Upper Volta.

Mr. Lawlor: And that way we would come back with treasures unknown to Marco Polo and to the great Khan himself. We could

suspend the sittings of this body for a couple of years and really give Paris a going over, so to speak. Think of the benefits that would flow back upon us.

I don't think such a committee would spend a great deal of time in the United States. I don't want to be unduly narcissistic or chauvinistic—whatever it is that I am being this afternoon. I just came back from Detroit yesterday afternoon; spent a couple of days there. What a dreadful place. You remember Los Angeles, which Huxley used to call the city of dreadful joy—the way in which it is laid out; its thoroughfares and its uniformity, its dullness, its total monotony. And about a quarter of a century ago a writer who usually worked on the solar plexus—mostly plexus without hardly any solar at all—someone by the name of Henry Miller who wrote a book called 'The Air Conditioned Nightmare," and without, indeed, the air conditioning, Detroit struck one as pretty appalling as you went down Woodward Ave. So I think we can learn a lesson from that just by the simple fact of negatizing something.

I would like to put Jane Jacobs on the record this afternoon. We were fortunate to have her living as a fellow citizen in this city. What she has to say against the impact of all the urbanologists from the time of Howard on, and down through Lewis Mumford and others, who do tend to be rationalistic and too logical, laying out the paths and laying out the parks. Well, there's a certain kind of divine or mad disorder in Jane Jacobs which leads to rather human conclusions.

She, looking at the whole situation says:

> Look what we have built with the first several millions of dollars; low-income projects that become worse centres of delinquency, vandalism, and general social hopelessness than the slums they were supposed to replace. Middle-income housing projects which are truly marvels of dullness and regimentation, sealed against any buoyancy or vitality of city life. Luxury housing projects that mitigate their inanity, or try to, with a vapid vulgarity.
>
> The cultural centres that are unable to support a good bookstore. Civic centres that are avoided by everyone but bums who have fewer choices of loitering places than others. Commercial centres for their lack-lustre imitation of standardized suburban chainstore shopping. Promenades that go from no place to nowhere and have no promenaders. Expressways that eviscerate great cities. This is not the rebuilding of cities. This is the sacking of cities.

I suppose everyone in this assembly is acquainted with her nostrums. She is not afraid of concentrated growth, of high densities, provided that they are set up in ways that give a total mix, so that community centres—

Mr. Givens: She was a great supporter of Harbor City.

Mr. Lawlor: —the concept of neighbourhoods, is engendered. She found that this was the case where she lives—or did live until recently—around Bloor and Spadina Rd. there, but finds it in pockets throughout the city which have real vitality. Some people would claim these places to be slums, but in her reckoning they are the places of the most vital growth. People are putting money into them. People are trying to keep them up. There is an air of friendliness and a flair of give and take; the sidewalks are used; the place is not simply restricted to parks. And she has a whole vision of urban interliving, of neighbourhood rapport, which I think deserves the highest commendation and which may be, if we could only adopt it to any extent, at least a substantial solution to the problems of the great cities.

So as a previous hon. member has pointed out, the matter has been fairly thoroughly canvassed. What is necessary now is for human beings to take choices, to have either the courage or the intellectual competence to assess the various programmes that have come down like an inundation upon us, to ferret them out, and to make up your mind what you like and what you don't like and be willing to say so.

I think the problem at the present time is that we live in some limbo of indecision, because you know that irrespective of what you say on the one side of the fence on issues of urban living, you are going to have a plentitudinous crowd calling out against your position, and the harder you put it the more rabid will they become. And this is what as politicians, I am afraid, we don't like to face but which is requisite to doing; what the hon. member is desirous of bringing into being with the bill, namely, to make for more humane modes of living and greater social rapport and a deeper sense of community than presently exists in this somewhat anarchistic and dilapidated environment in which we live, where the commercial instinct is so predominant and overwhelming, unlike the cities of Europe. Jane Jacobs, it seems to me, might have saved

herself a lot of trouble. She picked up her basic lessons in Philadelphia and applied them in certain areas of New York City, but she has said, at least in her earlier writings, very little about the major cities of Europe. I mean one only has to go to a city like Verona, or a city like Florence, or Colombo, or Vienna, or any number of other towns. You are immediately struck by—and that is why we go there—the beauty, the aesthetic quality, the quality of life, the excitement and the redolence of the place.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Lawlor: Well you only got one New Democrat this afternoon. I think, we could go on for ever. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, when I start I would like it to be abundantly clear that I am in full support of the bill advanced by the member for St. David, although it is too bad, I really wish the Leader of the Opposition had stayed because I asked twice, if not three times, a very plaintive question—and some day I am going to get an answer—and that is why does all research by the loyal opposition have to come from the United States?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: The members heard me say it three times—that's four.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Give us something original.

Mr. Drea: I always give the members something original and this will be no different. First of all, it seems to me there have been a number of inaccuracies stated. One of the basic ones, and I think one of the fundamental ones, is that there is no foundation type of study by any government in this country. The House, only a week ago, went over the estimates which provided for payments to a thing called the ARF, and the "F" stands for "foundation" in Addiction Research Foundation.

There are remarkable similarities between the need for a foundation concerned with urban living and the need there was some years ago for a foundation for research and continuing study into what was at that time the most popular form of drug abuse, or the most prevalent form, alcohol. Of course, over the years it has changed to take into account and to do work on the newer forms of drug abuse, but the fundamental thing with the ARF is that it is a continuing thing. By its very institution this Legislature, and indeed, a predecessor government on this side of the House, recognized that there was no simple solution to the particular problem that was going to be studied, and there is no simple solution to the problems of urban living in Metropolitan Toronto or indeed, although they are on a lesser scale, in urban centres across this province, and in this country.

First of all, last year, in a great burst of dazzling headlines, there came the definitive study that apartments aren't necessarily good for the tax base. Up until the time that Price Waterhouse did the study in York borough on the impact of highrise apartments upon municipal taxation, it was commonly agreed that if you could get highrise accommodation built, preferably without space for children, it was a taxation godsend to the municipality. After the Price Waterhouse study, it turned out it was meaningless. That alone has changed many of the planning concepts in Metropolitan Toronto—one simple study.

Again, if I recall, it was during the tenure—and I admired his tenure—of the member for York-Forest Hill as the mayor of the city of Toronto that there was a concept devised that was supposed to make University Ave. in this city the Champs Elysees of North America. I give him great credit—

Mr. Givens: Cost us a lot of cash too.

Mr. Drea: That's right. I give him a lot of credit for that concept, but today we have all the urbanologists saying—and you read it day after day after day—that what we thought a little more than a decade ago was a marvellous achievement in downtown planning is now a sterile place. They are claiming it has outlived its usefulness. It has to be changed. It has to be altered because they have found the street isn't used, or at least not used to its full potential.

That is a very minor matter, because I think what the member for St. David is putting forward today is that the time has come when we have to study the impact of modern urban society, the highrise, the townhouse, the lack of a backyard—and that is something that has disappeared in most places in urban Canada only in the last 20 years—the disillusionment in ever achieving what used to be the Canadian dream of security and self-sufficiency, which was owning your own home.

These are things that only now are beginning to manifest themselves in urban society. We are far from having complete studies on this; far from it; we have only scratched the surface. If there was a solution that could be found in a single study, then I would agree that perhaps the time has come for action. But show me one simple bit of action that can be translated out of all the studies; because the more you go into studies on urban life, the more you find out that the people who made them find it very difficult to draw permanent and far-reaching conclusions from their work.

The impact of this bill, Mr. Speaker, would be to set up a continuing study. And while I have some reservations about confining it just to Metropolitan Toronto, I think it should begin in Metropolitan Toronto. This is the fastest growing, etc., etc., etc., urban area on the continent. It is something that is typically Canadian. There are no studies from the United States that can give us any impact upon Metropolitan Toronto—how can they; they don't have one?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): What about the work of Buckminster Fuller?

Mr. Drea: He's a builder, not a studier.

Mr. Roy: What about the other areas?

Mr. Drea: I'm coming up to your area; it's far north, you know.

Mr. Roy: Are you going to be able to get that far?

Mr. Drea: Well, confining it to Toronto may be a bit narrow. I think that's the place to start. And once it is established, and once some of the trends that do develop from the growth and from the changes in Metropolitan Toronto become evident, then it could be applied to other areas. It seems to me that rather than burden other communities with the cost and the expense and, perhaps, even the inconvenience of such studies, that the definitive material could be used as a basis for similar work by foundations, or by long-term studies that would meet with their problems.

To dismiss all of this as merely being something that flows out of many studies, or that perhaps there could just be co-ordinated studies—I really don't understand that kind of thing.

Less than a mile from this Legislature stands that magnificent edifice to modern urban planning in the city of Toronto, Ont., Canada; you can blame it on everybody; there it sits—St. James Town. What a magnificent design for modern urban living. What a magnificent microcosm of modern life. And they say that the time for action is now? St. James Town was to be an improvement.

I suggest to you, in terms of dollars and cents, or in terms of the modular construction concepts, or a great many other things, it may be an improvement, but I suggest to you that the quality of life there hasn't improved very much. Indeed, if we could only get inside, it may have disintegrated from what was there before—and what was there before wasn't very much.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to support this bill. I think if anything, the only fault of the hon. member for St. David is that she has just been too far ahead of her time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I too share the views of my colleague—

Mr. Lawlor: The member mustn't get too far ahead of his time, there.

Mr. Deacon: —regarding this bill. It's being sponsored by a lady who certainly wants to improve our city. But it's a disappointment in that I thought it was, when I first saw the title, a bill setting up a foundation to restore some of our old buildings as some follow-up of the Ontario Heritage Foundation, doing a special job for Toronto.

But I didn't realize it would be one that would be setting up a structure that I feel is not the best structure—and I'm surprised that the sponsor of this bill feels that it is the best structure—for dealing with the long-term problems and getting effective action to correct many of the long-term problems of this city.

As my colleague from York-Forest Hill said, the Bureau of Municipal Research has for years been dealing with our problems in a way that I think is most objective and very helpful, but it hasn't had political impact. It has been independent of public funding—public funding being government funding. It has stood on its own merit and had the support of a broad cross-section of this community for, I think, nearly 60 years now.

It has had some outstanding people directing its affairs and as a result has been able to provide independent research and informa-

tion that has been helpful to a lot of us interested in the problems of this city over that period of time.

They had a project in 1966 and 1967 which I thought provided an excellent method of comparing the urban problems of the 40 major cities of the world. Instead of having a structured study by a lot of experts, they involved 20 people in each of the 40 cities over a period of two years in the examination of what some experts thought would be the best solutions to various major problems in these urban centres.

Many people thought that was a strange exercise to undertake because they said: "What would a city like Ibadan in Nigeria have to contribute to solutions in a city as advanced as Toronto or Philadelphia?" But they found that in that city where they have desperate problems and a desperate lack of resources that they were able to suggest many ideas because of the desperation—from their desperation came inspiration.

This is one of the great results of that two-year study carried out under the auspices of their administrative research. They combined the contribution of elected representatives, appointed government people, business and citizen groups, and people of academic backgrounds in a loosely-knit but quite effective group. They were able to provide a critique on these solutions that experts submitted for various problems.

Now, I feel that based on the continuing inactivity of government in grasping and dealing with and solving these problems, we have got to take a new approach here. I am disappointed that the hon. member for St. David in introducing this plan didn't recognize something that all of us, including herself, have been working toward for some time—that is, involvement of citizens and politicians in dealing with these problems together in a manner that hasn't been really made use of in the past.

In the past we have assumed that the experts were the ones we had to look to for solutions. Only too often we have depended almost exclusively on them and then suddenly we have imposed upon the electorate a plan the experts have developed. In recent years people have said: "Sorry, we don't like the plan these experts and the politicians are telling us we should have. We think we have better answers."

Citizens are recognizing that because of their great familiarity with the problems of the urban situation such as we have here in Toronto, they indeed do have better answers than these experts and they have answers that the politicians are indeed beginning to accept.

We have had a reaction to a situation such as the Spadina Expressway, which occurred only because of the way it was developed. If that expressway proposal, developed over a period of time, had included in its study structure a cross-section of citizens who were involved with the problem of transportation in the north as well as the centre of the city, citizens from all walks of life, as well as the politicians who were responsible for deciding on the ultimate solutions, and making available to them experts who could give them background facts, I think they would have come up with a solution that wouldn't have had us at a standstill today with nothing being done. We have stopped the project because the plan put forward by the experts is not acceptable.

Surely this is also the problem with the Metro Centre which has been before the Municipal Board. When a group of experts working together with the politicians and the citizens just present a fait accompli, or endeavour to, it isn't acceptable. The proposed Pickering airport is another example.

We seem to fail to recognize that a new method is required. Citizens are now wanting to be involved at an early stage of the development of solutions to our urban problems and our other problems. as well, but particularly we're dealing today with the urban problems. If the member for St. David had suggested, perhaps, a form of select committee which included citizens who would deal with this question of urban problems on a continuing basis, having a structure of personnel who would periodically change, they'd be in a position not only to be informed about these problems but also in a position to develop tremendous political pressure to do something about them.

As my colleague from York-Forest Hill has said, we've heard enough of studies and read enough of studies and we've seen too little action. I submit that if we had a proposal before us to effectively bring together citizens and politicians, we would support it. Unfortunately, in the manner in which this bill has been brought forward today, we cannot support it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West?

The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I want you to imagine the day—three months or six months hence, if the government should happen out of an excess of lack of wisdom to adopt this bill and make it its own and it were therefore to be passed—that one of us in the Legislature would be asked in our ridings by a person looking for a house or worried about the journey to work or worried about all the other urban problems that press in on people daily, "What has the government actually done?" All we could say was, "They've set up TUF, the Toronto Urban Foundation". That was the government's ringing answer to the urban problems of the Province of Ontario.

I'm afraid I can hardly but join with my colleagues in failing to find any merit in this thing, particularly as the hon. member for St. David knows there is a mountain of reports already on the sociological and psychological effects of urban living. The fact that some of them may contradict themselves doesn't really justify yet another mountain of reports when in fact, there's some far more fundamental problems to be faced which I hope that she, in her career as an MPP on that side of the House, would, in fact, face and would try to bring the members of the cabinet to face as well.

This is simply a pretence of action and nothing more, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it manages to ignore completely—the reasons that our cities are in trouble right now. The hon. member wants us to have a foundation which will report, privily apparently, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs—who doesn't exist any more—on the sociological and psychological effects of urban living.

If you're a mother with three little kids and living on the 18th floor of an OHC highrise in St. James Town, the answer is very clear—urban living screws people up. It interferes with family life. It disrupts the way that kids grow up and all sorts of things—we know this. If you're a large family evicted from convenient and spacious accommodation at a low rent in an older part of Ottawa, you know that urban living forces people into not just poverty but to become paupers—we know that.

The sociological and psychological effect of living close together; of living in a rapidly changing environment; of living in an anonymous kind of plug-in society in which your only roots are having your name on the doorbell at the foot of the apartment building—surely you've got to go back further than that and look at the reasons that our cities are going this way and at the connivance of this government in this province at making our cities, in particular the Metropolitan Municipality of Toronto, go that way.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. member really wanted to get to some root causes, she could look at the capitalist system which, in fact, leads to the kinds of problems we have in this city right now. The growth of highrises in areas like St. James Town is based on the pursuit of profit by people who are much more concerned with making money than in providing accommodation in cities which are fit for people to live in. There's no question about it.

There's no reason simply to have a few Bandaids and studies and foundations and this sort of thing if the hon. member continues to accept that the law of the jungle will prevail in the building of a city like Metropolitan Toronto.

And let's face it, any members who read the local papers, and know the kind of political set-up that exists in this city and other major cities in the province, know perfectly well that there is a large and influential group within the city which is interested in land speculation, who are interested in development, who want to make money and in fact do very handsomely at it—and I could cite the names of some of the families and individuals who have been involved, quite regardless and with absolutely no compunction or any idea of the responsibility that they have for the building of the city. It's certainly a far cry from the enlightened people who built the cities such as Florence and Vienna and the other cities that the hon. member for Lakeshore has mentioned. And I am certainly sure that St. James Town will not go down in the annals of history in the way that the Galleria in Florence, for example, or the palaces of the other Italian cities have gone down.

Mr. Lawlor: If they had been capitalists they never would have been built.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Filling the coffers—

Mr. Cassidy: There are a few planners, a few citizens' groups, a few people like Jane Jacobs, and so on who, are fighting a desperate rearguard battle to try and enforce a sense of social responsibility upon the people who are building and developing cities right now. And just where is the Ontario govern-

ment? If one reads a study of the Toronto-centred region and looks through it—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Time—time!

Mr. Cassidy: —it is a ringing endorsation in fact, of the capitalistic development process which is leading to a doubling and a trebling of the size of this particular city within the next 30 or 40 years.

Cities of large size, like London, England, can be humane with a population of six or seven million if they build up to it over a period of time. But if we're screwed up right now, Mr. Speaker, what kind of sociological and psychological consequences can one predict, if this city trebles in size as is predicted in the Lithwick report over the next 35 years?

Now surely we don't need a Toronto Urban Foundation to tell us that something is seriously wrong in the planning of the government that sits on the side of the House where the hon. member for St. David sits? Of course, in capitalist terms, that may in fact benefit some friends of the Conservative Party, but I would suggest that it would certainly not benefit either the ordinary people who are resident within this city nor the people from the hinterland, from the rest of the province. They will in fact suffer because their cities will be sucked dry by the development that is allowed to go on in untrammelled fashion in the pursuit of private profit in the Toronto area, while the rest of the province simply starves and stagnates and does not have the modest kind of growth that would permit and encourage the humane development of cities, which are in fact fit for people to live in.

I'm afraid that the hon. member has just taken this question by the wrong end of the stick. I hope, and we hope on this side of the House, that perhaps she would see the error of her ways and would in fact work with the government and on the government, as we will be doing, in order to find some fundamental solutions. And one of those solutions must certainly be that you've got to take away the idea that you build cities only for profit. You build cities for people, and once this fundamental idea—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cassidy: —is accepted by the government then perhaps the sociological and psychological problems that the hon. member has begun to cotton on to, could in fact be solved and not simply alleviated with a few Bandaids.

Mr. Lawlor: In a year or two the member for St. David will be over here.

Mr. Speaker: This completes the private members' hour.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the House revert to the fourth order and go back into committee of the whole so we can continue with the Bill 105 at 8 o'clock.

Clerk of the House: The fourth order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. W. Hodgson in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: It being 6 o'clock, the Chairman shall now leave his chair until 8 o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 29, 1972

Political activity of chairman of OEC, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2881

Regional government boundaries, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deans 2881

Amateur hockey association's ban on girl player, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Deans 2882

Assistance to municipalities for sewage treatment, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Roy, Mr. Martel 2882

Liquor regulations change, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy, Mr. Shulman 2883

Political activity of chairman of OEC, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2886

Study of water diversion in northern Ontario, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Stokes 2886

Weekend parking for public at Department of Labour lots, questions of Mr. Guindon and Mr. Snow: Mr. Givens 2887

Treasury bills, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. MacDonald 2888

WCB hospital fire claims, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Shulman 2888

Summer jobs at LCBO stores, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Bounsall 2888

Government plane accident, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Reid 2889

Automobile insurance, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans, Mr. Reid 2889

Legal aid for US citizens, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Ruston 2890

Absence of judge from duty, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Roy, Mr. Singer 2890

Pipeline route location, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Burr 2891

Dome Petroleum pipeline, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Paterson 2891

Industrial Safety Act, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Gisborn 2891

Simcoe Day, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. G. E. Smith 2891

Study of performance loan programme, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent 2892

Presenting annual report, Ontario Municipal Board, Mr. Bales 2892

Medical Practitioners, Registered Nurses and Others from Liability in Respect of Voluntary Emergency First Aid and Medical Services, bill to relieve, Mr. Shulman, first reading 2892

Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Paterson, first reading 2893

Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees, bill to provide for, in committee 2893

Private members' hour 2914

Toronto Urban Foundation, bill to establish, on second reading, Mrs. Scrivener, Mr. Givens, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Drea, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Cassidy 2914

Recess, 6 o'clock 2925

No. 74



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, May 29, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

CROWN EMPLOYEES COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ACT
(*continued*)

House in committee on Bill 105, An Act to provide for the Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees.

Mr. Chairman: I believe when we rose at 6 o'clock we were on section 17. Is there any further discussion on this?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I think we have lost all the tooth-and-nail people over there, but maybe there's another word or two to be said about section 17.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that section 17 really is not a reasonable or fair section to be included—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The member's social philosophy is pretty primitive.

Mr. Singer: Well, yes it is. The hon. member for Ottawa Centre, who has been noted by his silence in this debate, now chooses to interject. Hopefully we will have the advantage of his erudition before we get too far along tonight.

In the meantime, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to section 17 and to tell the minister that I think that it really is an anathema in so far as being an important part of this statute. I think it flies really in the face of what the minister purports to do, which by and large has some merit; but it flies substantially in the face of what he purports to do in section 6.

The qualifications that are now written into section 17 unfortunately derogate to such an extent from the right of free bargaining, recognizing of course that we have put very substantial limits on the traditional right of labour to withhold its services in earlier sections of this Act.

The quid pro quo surely should have been, Mr. Chairman, the government saying, "We will give you the right to discuss, to negotiate and finally to arbitrate almost everything that is a subject or a concern in relation to your employment."

But what in fact do we see when we come to section 17? Section 17 is the limitation section; it withdraws from collective bargaining so many of the very important things that logically should form the topic for discussion as between democratically oriented employers and democratically oriented employees. The Act says, "Every collective agreement shall be deemed to provide that it is the exclusive function of the employer to manage . . ." Well, that's all right up to that point. And perhaps if we had a period there, and the section ended at that point, it would make some sense.

Then it goes on to say that, "This function, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes"—and here comes the crunch; here is where you take away rights. Having already taken away the right to strike, one would have thought this would have given the government great pause; that the government would have been very careful and would have been writing in most restrictive language what was going to follow that kind of qualifying phrase. The right to, "determine employment, appointment, complement, organization, work methods and procedures"—all that the minister said earlier this afternoon and that we were talking about at great length.

He could remember the hours we spent talking about mechanization, of automation and that sort of thing. You've removed all that. You've removed all that from topics of discussion, topics of negotiation, topics of arbitration so that the government's view is absolute and final. Notwithstanding you've taken away the right to strike, you take away the rights to discuss these matters.

The right to "determine employment, appointment, complement, organization, work methods and procedures, kinds and locations of equipment"—well, I just dealt with that—"discipline and termination of employment, assignment, classification, job evaluation, system, merit system, training and development, appraisal, superannuation".

Superannuation—my leader referred to that earlier this afternoon. Surely, in most usual, ordinary and pertinent labour management bargaining, superannuation contracts should be discussed and methods, improvements and benefits be determined. They should relate to what is going on across the whole economic field in this province and in this country.

But no, the government sees fit to withdraw those as matters of negotiation, to withdraw those as matters of bargaining and say, "Our word is the law; the be-all, the end-all and there is no room for discussion." It really doesn't matter if the custom in the community now is that superannuation be on such-and-such a formula. If the government, in its wisdom or lack of it, determines that you have half the going rate or half the going formula, that's it. You can't even discuss it any more. You can't argue about it, nor can you withdraw your labour. This is what the government abrogates to itself.

The principles and standards of giving "promotions and demotions, transfer, lay off, reappointment"—well, I dealt with that earlier this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, in relation to section 6. I don't see what the difference is if by section 6 you give it and by 17 you take it away. Since 17 comes later than six in the statute, you really haven't given anything in six; you've taken it away in 17.

"Reappointment in such matters will not be the subject of collective bargaining nor come within the jurisdiction of a board"—well, there it is.

The government says "We are the boss and don't you kid yourselves. We are going to continue to be the boss and these rights which we enumerate, no matter how contrary to custom, no matter how arbitrary we may want to be, notwithstanding the fact we have taken away your right to strike, these matters can be decided only by government and the view of the employees in this regard is of no import to us; of no substance, of no importance."

There it is and that's the very unfair thing about this Act. Really, Mr. Chairman, that is the reason my colleagues and I voted against this statute on second reading.

As if subsection (1) of section 17 is not bad enough, we have subsection (2) which is supposed to colour it; supposed to give some chocolate icing to the cake, I suppose.

"In addition to any other rights or grievance under a collective agreement an employee claiming that his position has been improperly classified" and we go through four headings, let me deal with them just very briefly, one by one, "An employee claiming that his position has been improperly classified can grieve." What is the point of his grievance, because if you go back to 17 (1), the government has reserved to itself the right to classify? Government has said: "We can classify and no one can challenge us. We lay down the basis on which classification is going to take place and that's it." That is the end.

What kind of a grievance can the most conscientious grievance board really deal with if the government has abided by its own rules? So the right to grievance in that particular is quite meaningless.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, through sub (b)—"that the employee has been appraised contrary to the governing principles and standards"—the governing principles and standards are laid down by the government. And if the government lives by, or appears to live by, the standards that it has unilaterally determined, what's the point of going to the grievance board?

You have given the grievance board no other alternative. Here are the standards. Here is the way we have judged this particular employee, and what alternative has the grievance board got? It must go along with what the government has said.

The only point of grievance under (a), (b), (c) or (d), really, is that the government is going to ignore its own standards—and I don't think any careful government is going to do that.

But what it does in fact mean, Mr. Chairman, is that the government can set its standards as arbitrarily as it sees fit without any consultation whatsoever. As long as it abides by those arbitrary standards, then the government is in a position, and is able, to enforce those standards; and you can grieve until you are blue in the face, and it doesn't mean a single thing.

So this is supposedly a benefit. Yes, sure, you can grieve, employee, sure you can grieve if you feel that you have been badly done by, but don't grieve against our arbitrary actions, because we can be as arbitrary as we want to; and we intend to be, and no one will judge our arbitrary decisions because no one has the right to judge. And we take them away from bargaining, and we take them away from conciliation, and we take them away from arbitration.

Or "(c), contrary to the governing principles and standards or to the methods of effecting promotions, demotions, transfers,

layoffs, or reappointments, provided in the collective agreement, he has been promoted, demoted, transferred, or laid off, or has not been reappointed"; those things are allowed to be grieved about.

But go back to sub 1, Mr. Chairman, and you will see again that the government can be as arbitrary as it wants to. And if the government has arbitrarily laid down unfair, unrealistic, unreasonable restrictions, then it is acting within the power that the minister now asks for, and no grievance board is going to be able to assist any employee who has been unfairly treated so long as the government has acted within its own arbitrarily determined standards.

And finally, "Or has been disciplined or dismissed or suspended from his employment without just cause;" and perhaps to stretch a point, supposing the government, having removed all these things from the process of bargaining, from the process of conciliation, from the process of arbitration, says: "We reserve to ourselves the right to dismiss anybody arbitrarily"—and they could, and that's the power they are asking for—what's the point of grieving under sub (d) of 17.2? No point at all!

Now the minister is going to say: "Isn't that silly? You can't really imagine a well-intentioned government acting in that kind of way." Well I say, if the minister is going to give that kind of reply, which I would fully expect, then why doesn't he have the courage to write it in the legislation?

Now, we all know the minister is a fair man, an equitably minded man, and he certainly isn't going to take advantage of anyone. It is not him that I particularly worry about, it's his successor who might be sitting there tomorrow morning.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Worried about your successor already!

Mr. Singer: But I'm worried, Mr. Chairman, about what's going to be in the statute, and I'm worried that when government takes unto itself this kind of arbitrary and unreasonable power, that one can reasonably expect it's going to be abused. When the statutes say that governments can act unreasonably, somewhere along the line a government is going to act unreasonably.

Well there it is, Mr. Chairman, I think section 17, subs 1 and 2, are most unreasonable, most illogical, and most unfair for the 70,000 employees of the Province of Ontario.

We are going to vote against section 17 and we hope that these words, which have been addressed not only today but on second reading and down in the legal bills committee, will finally have had some effect on the minister. We urge him to take this back and rework it, so that notwithstanding, whatever his good intentions might be tonight or whatever he thinks they might be tomorrow morning, that the good intentions will be enshrined in the legislation of the Province of Ontario, and we are not going to have to depend on the goodwill of the goodwilled member for Huron.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before 5.00 o'clock p.m. I was speaking to the minister about the reasons why some of the areas were included in section 17, and I would like to hear from the minister his explanation as to why it is the government feels it's necessary to have each and every one of these involved as part of managerial rights. I'd like to hear from the minister, for example, what it is about the decision on the complement of a particular area of the civil service that he feels is of such vital importance to management that they cannot ever discuss it across the bargaining table with their employees. I'd like to know from the minister why it is that such things as work methods and procedures cannot become a part of bargaining, what it is about them, and with examples wherever possible, of what it is the minister sees as the pitfalls that would naturally come about if the government decided to allow the employee to raise those matters across the bargaining table.

I would like to ask the minister if he could explain to me what it is about the location and the kind of equipment that is used by the government that makes it so important that the employee cannot talk about that during collective bargaining sessions. Or what it is about the disciplined termination of employment that makes the minister feel that the government has such an insight into these things that they don't want the benefit of the employee's views, if and when the employee feels that perhaps the procedures being used by the government, on behalf of the civil service, are not correct and are working a hardship on the members of the association, and on and on.

I can go through them all, but I would like if the minister could begin and just take them one by one, starting at comple-

ment, and explain to this House why each one of those is included in this section. There must be a logical explanation for it; I know that this minister wouldn't just have it in there because it happened to be written up by someone in the drafting department. It must be there for a reason, and I would like it if the minister could rise and tell me what the reason is.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): Very well. The principles and standards, Mr. Chairman, that we dealt with this afternoon—probably not to the satisfaction of every member of the House—are very difficult to be specific about because they do change as social requirements change. I think everybody knows that. To find a definition would be impossible—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): What you're talking about is the Tory way of handling things.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I might just say, if we are going to have that kind of intervention, that the Tory way has suited this province for quite some time and I am content that it will suit this province for a long time to come. That's the kind of interjection, quite frankly—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): How much money did it take this time out, Charlie?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —that will spoil this debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If my hon. friend wants to keep on making them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: Listen to your trained seals over there!

Mr. Lawlor: That is a self-serving statement unworthy of you, Charles MacNaughton.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do you want to pursue the debate along those lines, Mr. Chairman? I hope you call us out of order, because that's not pursuing House in committee on this piece of legislation. But I suggest to you, if you want to tolerate it, I can deal with those kinds of interjections just as well as the hon. member who last spoke can.

Mr. Gisborn: We have been waiting all afternoon for you to deal with it.

Mr. Martel: You are getting provocative, Charlie.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, no, but I can be provoked on certain things.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You are certainly not evocative, so you might as well be provocative.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I can be; I can be!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman to get back on track, I can be, as the hon. member said, as quoted in the press, intransigent about things I believe in. I can do that. Yes, I can.

Mr. Lewis: Oh yes, you can! You can even be intransigent about things you don't believe in.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not very often.

Mr. Lewis: You do that most of the time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not very often; not very often.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: He could be intransigent about most of these things.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I could in some circumstances, because I say to you, through you, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is not one of those things I believe in.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that, thank God!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not one of them; not one of those sitting around his elbows there.

Now to get back to the answer to the question by the hon. member for Wentworth. If location and kinds of equipment, in very simple terms, is not a fundamental right of management, to determine the kinds of equipment and the location of equipment to best perform the work, I frankly would be very much surprised.

Mr. Deans: Why then would you be afraid to discuss it with your employees?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Then I would have to say, and I am going to have to be repetitive here—

Mr. Deans: Yes, please do.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But if the hon. member can tell me how the question of location and kinds of equipment in a collective agreement, written and agreed to by two parties, under the bill that we are discussing here differs greatly or differs in substance from what I read earlier about management functions, article 3, in the contract of agreement between labour and management in a large manufacturing industry in this province—

Mr. Cassidy: Which you still won't identify!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now just let me draw that to your attention if I may once again and see if you can find any material difference in what I am suggesting.

Mr. Deans: I didn't write that clause. I am not debating. I don't have any right to change it.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, but I am reading it. I didn't write it either. I'm writing one.

Mr. Deans: Give us the one you wrote.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly, exactly; but I am trying to point out, Mr. Chairman, that there is a very close parallel in this Act respecting the public service of the province and in this collective agreement respecting the employees of an industry in the private sector.

Mr. Deans: Are you prepared to grant the civil servants all of the same rights that are contained in that agreement?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are granting them!

Mr. Deans: Just pick out the ones you like.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister is replying to the member's questions.

Mr. Lewis: Well what is this fictitious agreement you are dealing with?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It isn't a fictitious agreement.

Mr. Lewis: Does the company have a name? Does the union have a name?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes the union has a name; and the company has a name.

Mr. Lewis: Let's hear it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have indicated it is a manufacturing company and a large one, but I am not going to disclose the name.

An hon. member: Is it a sweetheart?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I could tell you privately.

Mr. Deans: I might if you tell me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I might tell you privately, but I am not going to disclose it publicly.

Mr. Lewis: I have no idea who they are.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh well, great friends of yours.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, well I can guess.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This agreement suggests "the number and location of offices, plants and facilities."

Mr. Lawlor: That narrows it down, doesn't it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Is there any material difference in it, Mr. Chairman, to what we are reciting in this bill? "The number and location of offices, plants and facilities, services to be performed"; fundamentally the same thing that we are talking about. "The location and type of equipment" —same thing.

Mr. Deans: Oh no!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh yes it is.

Mr. Deans: No it is not.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well don't split hairs, I say to you through the Chairman. Don't split hairs.

Mr. Deans: Split hairs? What is splitting hairs?

Mr. Singer: What does that prove?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It proves—

Mr. Singer: An unidentified agreement; you won't even tell us who it is; how many people it affects. That's your bias. It's a bunch of nonsense!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well you regard it as a bunch of nonsense.

Mr. Singer: Well tell us how many businesses—

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Singer: —and trades it affects.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I'll repeat it, it's on the record.

Mr. Singer: Well if he is going to be specious about it.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member was listened to very carefully.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I can't remember interfering with that loud, rather lengthy, dissertation—erudite dissertation as you would call it—at all.

Mr. Singer: Well I'm glad you recognize what it was worth.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You're very erudite.

Mr. Deans: Couldn't we begin at complement and work our way through them one by one; why couldn't we do that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, we can do that, yes of course. Complement is—

Mr. Deans: Why does the—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member's questions have been put.

Mr. Deans: I want to be sure he remembers.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well all right, I am going to be repetitive about one more thing, although I don't propose to get into every detail of section 17. The basic principle has been stated, stated several times, and I suggest to you that it's because the government, as the employer in this instance, is not inclined to abandon, to a third party, the decision-making process that I suppose in the final analysis is the right of this Legislature. That, I think, is a fair statement.

Mr. Lewis: But tell us why, tell us why! Maybe you'll convince us, who knows.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I'll put this in the form of a question to the hon. member. Does the hon. member see any distinction between the government as the employer—the Crown as the employer, answerable to the Legislature for its policies—and the pursuits of the relationship between the Crown to its employees, and the private sector and its employees?

Mr. Deans: Yes, I see a distinction.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You do?

Mr. Deans: I think that the Crown should be more fair, more equitable.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That's exactly what we are trying to do, and I'd have to tell you that we're interested in the people of the province as well as employees, and that adds up rather nicely. But I simply suggest to you I am not inclined, in any sense of the word, to contemplate any amendments to section 17 for the reasons that I have stated.

Mr. Singer: We sort of gathered that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well let's get it clearly on the record; and now I'll listen for ever if necessary.

Mr. Deans: You may have to listen for ever.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): We want to discuss this!

Mr. Deans: It may seem like a ridiculous exercise to try and convince you that some of the things in here are really not proper, but nevertheless I'll try. I don't mind going through ridiculous exercises with you.

Mr. Lewis: What other kind?

Mr. Deans: Under the terminology of complement, surely it is the right of the representatives of the employees to discuss with management over the bargaining table any reduction of complement which detrimentally affects their association or their organization. Do you agree?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In the interests of this legislation and the relationship between the government and the public servants of this province, I do not agree with that.

Mr. Deans: You do not agree?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No I don't.

Mr. Deans: You don't agree that in the case of technological change and other forms of change there is an obligation on the employees' representatives to be able to dis-

cuss with management the effect of any change on its members?

I say to you that right in the very first word, "complement," you deal with all of the matters such as rationalization of your operations; you deal with matters like those raised by the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) earlier in regard to contracting out of work to outside agencies. It seems to me, in looking at this, that the complement of people involved ought to be a matter for direct negotiation, so that there can be the kind of discussion between the employees and the management in the event that management decides to cut down the complement and tender the work out to the private sector. I see that happening, and I suspect that's exactly why you've got it in here. I think you've got it in here so that you can, in fact, cut down the work force.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You have a nasty, suspicious turn of mind.

Mr. Deans: Yes, that's my suspicious turn of mind, because you are unable to answer for the terms that you have contained in your bill. And until you convince me otherwise, I want to believe that in fact the intention of the government is to cut the civil service and to put the work out to tender. You don't want the civil service to have the right to negotiate on the complement of people who will be used in any particular job. That's the first one.

As far as the others are concerned we can go through them all—we may at some point—but I want to go to another that really bothered me, the matter of training and development, because it goes well with the matter of complement. Training and development; surely the discussions centering around the retraining and re-education of employees is a matter which ought to be negotiable between the employee and the management, and for management to claim that that's one of management's rights is nonsense.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In your opinion.

Mr. Deans: In my opinion—right. Everything I say here is my opinion.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly.

Mr. Deans: I never say anything unless I believe it. And I believe it to be true here.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are not that qualified.

Mr. Deans: I believe that you will regret having this in the bill. I don't think you need it in the bill. I think if you were operating your own company you wouldn't require it in the bill, or in the way in which you operate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing the hon. member cannot try to do and that's try to read my mind.

Mr. Deans: Oh I know it's tough; but it's okay.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well don't even try.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): He's got some extra-sensory perception though, Charlie.

Mr. Deans: There's only one thing you can do with your mind, you can read it quickly. It's like reading a small book.

Mr. Lewis: And that concedes that there's something to read!

Mr. Lawlor: A little like Sanskrit.

Mr. Deans: In every single instance, as you go through it, I can think of any number of reasons why those matters ought to be subject to discussion. That doesn't mean that they're ever going to change.

It doesn't mean that if the government, through its Management Board, has an argument that is more substantial than the argument being put forward by the employees, that there will ever be any change take place—you've taken care of that in the previous section, section 11—that even if it did go to arbitration, there is no guarantee that the employee will ever get what he wants or what he needs or what he deserves. But at least he will have the opportunity to make his view known on the effect of management decisions on his day-to-day life. I think that that's an important and integral part of any step forward.

Now you point with some pride to some ridiculous little document that you've plucked out of some contract. I don't care where the contract came from. I don't care. It could be the biggest contract in Ontario. I want to tell you that I don't think that in this changing day, when technology changes, when procedures change, and employment changes, that there is such a thing as a clearly defined black and white situation in regard to what is management's prerogative and what are employee prerogatives; I think that we have to always be flexible.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You don't believe what is written into a contract?

Mr. Deans: In that contract? No, I don't believe what is written in that contract.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You don't believe that?

Mr. Deans: I think that unless you—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Unless you put into it that there is no material change during the currency of that contract.

Mr. Deans: That is right! I think that there has to be some guarantee that when changes come about, whether as a result of decisions of management or as a result of some outside influence, that there is the opportunity for both sides to sit together and to come up with a sensible and viable resolution of the problem. All the way down through this, starting with complement—some of the words don't make much sense to me frankly. Organization—I suppose it's the organization of the business itself; I am not going to quarrel with you; you can organize your business whatever way you like. But in terms of the location of equipment I would point out to you that there are many jobs in the province of Ontario where the employee has a damn sight better idea of what is needed by way of equipment, and for safety purposes the kind of equipment that ought to be used, than the management board has. You could benefit considerably by the expertise of some of the people out in the field.

As far as discipline and termination of employment are concerned, I do believe there is room in that clause for discussion at the bargaining table. I do believe there are things which heretofore have been the cause of disciplining and termination of employment which in fact ought to be subject to negotiation. I think that even enshrined right in this bill are things that will cause a great deal of hardship; that in fact ought to be subject to negotiation.

Much of the bill itself should have been subject to discussion between the CSAO on the one hand and CUPE on the other hand, together with the Management Board of cabinet, prior to the introduction of the legislation. But nevertheless, the whole matter of termination, the assignment of people to areas, are points I can see no problem over discussing.

The classification and the job evaluation system—surely with the on-the-job evaluation system, the people who are working on the job have some input into job evaluation. Surely management can benefit from a frank and open discussion across the bargaining table about methods of application of job evaluation. Surely they can benefit from the opportunity to hear what the work is all about from the people who actually do the work. Most of you sitting on the Treasury benches haven't the faintest idea what goes on in much of the civil service; any more than we have.

I suggest to you that the employees are able to have a substantial input into any discussion in regard to job classification and the application of the classification system, or the evaluation system. I say training and development obviously is an integral part of the changing world. There just must be the opportunity for a working relationship between the employee and the employer in the establishment of educational and retraining programmes. If you don't have that you inevitably end up with poorly trained employees; because they don't understand what the programme is all about, nor do they have any part in determining how it can be best carried out.

Mr. Martel: God knows what is good for them!

Mr. Deans: It has become a standard practice in a number of places to involve the union in the discussion of appraisal forms and the way in which appraisals are made; the general area of appraisal of employees. In fact, employees are appraising other employees, and it makes sense that there be a discussion to determine what kind of appraisal forms are used; the questions that are sensibly and usefully put into the appraisal form.

And I say to you that if you go through these one by one and you come to superannuation, the determination of the future lifestyle of employees after they reach retirement age; you say that they can't have any input into the discussion as to: (a) how much they can put in; (b) the use to which the money can be put; and (c) the return on their investment.

I just happen to feel that view is, from my point of view, to make it clear, extremely old-fashioned — not archaic, old-fashioned. That is how they did it back in the 1920s when pensions were the exception rather than the rule. But in this day and age it is becoming more and more customary to include the trade union or the association, whichever it may be, in the discussion of

the use of pension funds and superannuation programmes.

I would really have liked to hear from the minister and he is obviously not going to do it—but I would like to have heard from the minister what brought about the inclusion of all of these particular headings in this bill. I would like to know.

I don't care how long it takes; I am prepared to wait. But I would like to know from the minister on an individual basis, dealing with each one, what it is that he sees is likely to occur that demands that it be a part of management rights, with no opportunity for negotiation or discussion in each of those. I would like him to tell me what is wrong with what I am suggesting to him.

What is wrong with permitting the kind of frank and open discussion between employer and employee that will bring about a better working relationship and therefore a happier work place? That is what we are all striving for. Maybe we strive in different directions, but that is what we are trying to accomplish.

I just ask you, the minister, through Mr. Chairman, since the bill was brought in by the minister and since he is prepared to defend it without considering an amendment at all—as he says, no amendment—surely he is prepared, on a very individual basis, to deal with each matter and tell us what it is.

Tell us what it is that brought about the inclusion of whatever you want to call on—training and development! What brought about that? What brought about the others? Why do you feel they must be there? Why are they not in the other section—which I disagree with too by the way—why are they not in the section of things that can be negotiated rather than the section of things that can't be negotiated?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West—the hon. minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think, maybe, one at a time is good measure here. The hon. member repeats discussion—

Mr. Deans: That is what negotiating is.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let's draw some distinctions. The weight of the words was on discussion, and of course discussion itself is fine. I would say that those of you who have read the report on human resources, report No. 6 of COGP, will see that it comes down heavily on the side of doing those things, associated with the fact that we regard our human resources as our greatest asset. I think that is quite evident to those of you who have read the report. Maybe you haven't read the report—

Mr. Lewis: Quite a revelation.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Maybe you haven't read the report! I would be inclined to say, with some conviction, that there will be great discussion take place for those people; but to translate discussion into bargaining in the final analysis is another story.

Mr. Deans: Why?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, you have expressed your views—

Mr. Deans: I am asking you why?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, we will get back to some of the specifics that you asked me to comment on.

Surely training and development must be a determination of management as to what will benefit the work that the employer wants done.

Now, is it to be determined by the employee that, because there is a training and development course in a certain field, it should be open to him to take it—unless the employer is convinced that it will benefit the work he expects of that employee? I think not. I think that is the employer's determination to make. Of course, we are not going to agree on these things. I say to the leader of the New Democratic Party that I contend, sir, that my opinions are just as valid in this forum as are the opinions of the House leader for the NDP.

Mr. Lewis: Clearly you have no conception of what an employee might contribute to a discussion of this kind.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now my hon. friend comes back to the difference between discussion and bargaining. I am quite prepared to say—

Mr. Lewis: I use them interchangeably. I don't see the negotiations like that, as a kind of confrontation—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, we are on different wavelengths here because I—

Mr. Lewis: We sure are!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well fine! It is not unusual, I say, Mr. Chairman, for that to exist.

Mr. Lewis: You use negotiations like a battleground.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Discussion, yes—

Mr. Stokes: Here's the so-called champion of labour from Eglinton back.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As I go right through section 17, as everyone of you who is debating on this section must have done, I can find nothing that shouldn't be the exclusive right of management in the field of bargaining in the public sector—in the public service as differing from the private sector.

I repeat and I hope it is not necessary to repeat it again, the Crown, the government, the Lieutenant Governor in Council, has seen fit by this Act to transfer what was its previous obligation and right, as spelled out in statute language, to a third party. That being the case, I say, without getting into them individually, that these matters set out in section 17 as exclusions are for some direction and hopeful benefit to the arbitrator who will make these determinations as a third party.

I don't want to repeat myself on this, Mr. Chairman. I think I have said that three times now and that is the basis upon which section 17 was premised.

Mr. Deans: We are obviously never going to agree on this. I just say to you that I see it exactly opposite to you.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! We are getting very repetitive now.

Mr. Deans: That's okay, I don't mind.

Mr. Chairman: I do. I have to rule against repetition.

Mr. Deans: Just hear what I say. This isn't repetitive.

I want to say to the minister that I see it entirely differently. Because you have taken away the right to withhold the services, because you have taken away the right to strike—a right which was never abused I say to you—you then must open up even wider the areas that are subject to negotiation. I think that those two principles go hand in hand. If you are going to deny a man the right to withhold his services, you are then going to open up the full scope of matters which can be negotiated.

I see the opposite to your view. You seem to feel that because you have gone to arbitration, you have the right then to withhold certain matters. But then you have gone to arbitration by your choice, not by the employee's choice. They didn't ask to go to arbitration. They were quite happy with the way things were. They didn't abuse the principle of striking.

The civil service of Ontario is not known throughout the country as being the kind of people who abuse their rights. In fact, the contrary is the case. They have never ever used the rights they had and that has been the problem. Because you decide as the government to take away a right which was previously theirs, you then have an obligation. That obligation is to provide for them every possible opportunity to negotiate and to discuss, if you prefer, all of the matters that pertain to their day-to-day work for the government of the Province of Ontario—not the opposite.

You have done the exact opposite; you've got your principles mixed up.

At the risk of being repetitive I just will never understand how you can come to the conclusion, because you, as the government, decide that matters may be determined by a third party, that that then necessitates your narrowing the field in terms of those matters that can be negotiated. I would have thought—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There are a number of areas that separate us.

Mr. Deans: I agree; and I would frankly have thought—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That may well have been the way of things years ago—

Mr. Deans: It is funny you should say that. As I drove to—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That's typical of the arrogance that comes from that side.

Mr. Deans: —Hamilton over the supper hour, I thought to myself, and I was thinking back to what you said in the afternoon and the disagreement that we had—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You drove to Hamilton and back in the supper hour?

Mr. Deans: Yes. I drove to Hamilton and back in the supper hour to open a baseball game. I just thought to myself—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You must not have had much time for supper.

Mr. Lewis: No, he left at five o'clock.

Mr. Deans: —now I know why I'm not a Tory. I could never agree with the principles that you have enunciated in this bill, because I think they are destructive to all of the progress—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Suffice it to say you know why you are not and I know why I am.

Mr. Deans: That's right. I think the principles that you have enshrined in this legislation are destructive of all of the progress that has been made in the civil service and outside of the civil service in collective bargaining. I don't think that you have kept abreast with the changes in the collective bargaining processes I don't think that you are aware of the sense of commitment of the civil service to the people of the Province of Ontario; I think you underestimate them, I think you do them a disservice, because I happen to have more faith in them than you do. I believe that, had they the right to negotiate on all things, they would negotiate sensibly. I don't think they would abuse their power, and there is nothing in the record to prove that I'm wrong.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, the most disturbing feature of the bill to me is the overall feeling of this clause 17, because of either the mistrustful view that it has of the employee or of the low opinion of his intelligence. The fact is that apparently employees can't be trusted, in their first sitting down and bargaining collectively in the context of this particular bill—which the bill calls an Act to Establish and Provide Collective Bargaining—to use that collective bargaining, which this Act provides, to determine and arrive at what will be the exclusive functions of the employer.

The piece of paper which the minister holds up purporting to have some of the same phrases as are in clause 17 between a company and a union in the manufacturing sector, was not arbitrarily imposed upon the workers as this bill does upon the employees but was collectively agreed to by bargaining between the two of them. That's the big difference, as far as I see it.

This clause, as it is here in subsection 1, feels the employees will not be able to do that; or feels that they have not sufficient intelligence to arrive at a reasonable decision in talking to the employer with respect to what should be the particular management right and what should be their particular right.

The minister sees everything here in either black or white terms. By the minister's own example, when he talks about training and development what we are saying, or what I am saying, is that training and development should be a matter which is negotiable, should be bargained on, should not be an exclusive right of the employer. The minister stands up and says in answer that should not be an exclusive right of the employee. That's not what we are talking about. I am not carrying a brief that training and development should be an exclusive right of the employee, but something which the employee and the employer can sit down and talk about.

The words that have been added to both clause 6 and 17, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, were to make all those sections which follow in the form of an example; and yet here we have if you count them—I count 20 separate features where the minister has said our employees will not have any right to talk about at any time ever, not even in the first contract which they negotiate, to determine what should be negotiable.

Mr. Martel: What do you leave them to negotiate?

Mr. Lewis: Wages!

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman, there are various sections in here on which, if I was part of management, I would like to have my employees' views at many times. And I refer specifically to the merit system. There isn't any sort of system, particularly one involving merit, that shouldn't be changing almost continuously, which shouldn't be talked about, not just from time to time but on a pretty regular basis. Here we have it as the sole prerogative of management, and in that type of situation management is getting into a situation where its employees can say nothing about the merit system and will be in a permanent state of dissatisfaction; it is the unlanced boil on their working condition life.

Out of all those 20 or so sections, really you can pick out only four to specify as grievances, even though you do give a right to collective bargaining and have written it into the agreement. But with a very carefully thought out 20—or maybe not so carefully

thought out 20—you can really only find four in subsection 2 which cover grievances. When you get to look at some of the 20, I think by the minister's own admission he has left some of them rather vague.

The minister has been asked from time to time here today to define what he means by various of these sections, and to show the differences between one of the clauses in section 6 and work methods and procedure in this bill. And the minister has rather implied that he has left it pretty vague. What he is doing by leaving it vague is two things: Begging the question as to why he put many of these clauses in at all; and, secondly, he is creating a large headache for his tribunals which will have to keep looking at these things and trying to draw the line where a right given in section 6 ends and where a right withheld for management in section 17 begins and ends off. I am just not happy with the overall concept of mistrust here, nor with the generalities contained in section 17 and some specifics like the merit system.

But, Mr. Chairman, the thing that bothers me most here, and I indicated I would have liked to have put it in as an amendment in section 6, is superannuation. There is no vagueness there whatsoever, especially in this day and age, when we are moving to a time when many of the bargaining agents are talking not only about superannuation as part of the terms of collective bargaining, but about what kinds of superannuation and about what portion of their own superannuation—their own money, their own pension plans, which they negotiate—they are going to be able to have control over themselves.

This is so far removed from the present-day discussions that are going on between collective bargaining agents and management in this particular area that it's hard to believe. We are moving from the situation where we now have people talking about the investment of their superannuation funds to not being able to talk about the superannuation funds at all.

Because of that, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by Mr. Gisborn that the word "superannuation" be removed from clause 17(1) of this bill.

Mr. Martel: Putting the Tory government in charge of superannuation is like putting Dracula in charge of the blood bank.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bounsall moves that the word "superannuation" be removed from clause 17, subsection 1, of Bill 105.

The member for Simcoe East has a question, I believe.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Chairman, I had a comment or a question on grievances, perhaps this does not deal with the amendment that has been moved. Shall I make it at this time?

Mr. Chairman: Better make it now, because when we deal with the amendment, the section will have been carried.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Well Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the minister. It is a question which I assume reflects the concern of the some 2,000 civil servants I represent, that section 17 (2) of Bill 105 will not limit the scope for the reasons of grieving that the members of the civil service now enjoy. I would hope that the minister could assure us that we are not taking away any of these privileges they now have. Perhaps the minister could comment.

Mr. Martel: The right to grieve.

Mr. Lawlor: How do you figure that one now? He can't get away with that.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Yes, he can.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member for Simcoe East—

Mr. Lawlor: He is absolutely right.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —that everything that can be bargained for and finds its way into a collective agreement can be grieved for, in addition to the four subsections of section 17 (2).

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, the minister does a great disservice to the House, and I believe to himself, when he expresses as he did a few moments ago that he is prepared to listen forever but that he will not change his attitude on this bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I said on this section.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Or on this section, right. I presume that it applies to the rest of the bill, unless some typographical error is found.

Mr. Deans: Unless you change his thinking.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Because thinking back to the beginning of this debate in principle—Mr. Chairman, you may recall if you were in the House—the minister could only be persuaded by a great deal of urging and babying, in fact, to take part in that debate at all. If you will recall, he was not going to defend the bill but he was prepared to use the majority that supports the ministry simply to ram it through.

Now, as I have said, we have discussed this and voted on it in principle, and it's interesting when one considers the reaction that we as private members and myself as leader of a party have received from the community on the content of this bill and the principle behind it. Because if one were not to count the submissions from the Civil Service Commission I can tell you in great candour that I have received three letters—two of them opposing our stand in this party, which was to vote against the bill, and one favouring it. In other words, while we are concerned with the principle and particularly with the intent of section 17, we are in many respects acting in a vacuum. And with great respect to the Civil Service Commission, although they have had people marching out in front on two or three occasions and did present, I am told, submissions to the standing committee, there is the impression on all sides that the attack against the government's position has been something less than, well—

Mr. Singer: Robust!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —robust, a very good word indeed.

In other words, we are here discussing I think in—I wouldn't say in a vacuum, but in a rather rarefied atmosphere, the contents of this bill and particularly this section. So, for the minister to say: "Well, we have a majority, therefore we are not going to listen to the argument and this will stand even though I have to sit here"—to paraphrase the minister—"and listen to what you say all night long." Well, I sincerely trust that none of us will be put to that test.

Surely the minister, when he brings forward this legislation, which in my opinion will probably be the most farreaching legislation we consider at this session, deserves to give more credit to himself and the members of this House to enter into the kind of discussion which at least would give us confidence on this side that he is prepared to listen to reasonable and rational argument. I would presume that his statement, as he made it, was just one of those things that sometimes slips out from this hon. minister and that he didn't intend to give that impression.

But then the defence that was provided for him was a piece of paper upon which some sort of a collective agreement had been entered into with some industry and some union somewhere in this province which he is unprepared to name, in which certain rights were granted to management which the union representatives evidently agreed to. He wasn't prepared to tell us who they were, but I would suggest to him that he can look in that agreement wherever he chooses and he will find that there is no final section in the agreement which gives management the right to arbitrate the agreement.

So what he says in this particular piece of paper really has no relevance whatsoever to the discussion that is before us. So, Mr. Chairman, the minister has not assisted either the members of this House or the community at large to examine in any kind of light of understanding of what we are doing, just what the provisions are and how they are interpreted on the part of government.

I think it is quite obvious that what the minister does in section 17, when he adds all of those clauses, many of them obscure in the extreme, is that he is simply going to give a tangle of legal arguments for the arbitrators in the future to deal with. Those people representing the Civil Service Commission and those people representing the government will argue for months as to just what the meanings of all the clauses in section 17, or let's say all of the phrases in section 17, imply.

If he has confidence in the concept of arbitration, which has been decided by the House, then surely he should be satisfied with saying in section 17 that the employer has the exclusive function to manage.

Mr. Chairman, we do not argue with that. Whether you are making cars or whether you are operating a public service, makes no difference whatsoever – the government has the right to manage. But I submit that if the bill, and eventually the statute, gives the power to require these negotiations to go to arbitration, then the government ought to have the strength of mind to say that the arbitrator will decide what management is in the context of this particular agreement or disagreement, and what in fact can be left to the area of arbitration.

The minister knows full well that by moving to arbitration in all classes of public service, such as the employees of the Liquor Board, for example, in the long run it's going to cost the taxpayers plenty. We have had plenty of experience in this regard with compulsory arbitration in statutes and regulations that we have already approved.

I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that a serious mistake is made in section 17, if the minister is going to insist on the intransigence in which he seems to take such pride and if he will not even consider the alternatives that have been put forward.

Frankly, I would agree with the last speaker who feels that superannuation should be taken out of section 17. I suggested earlier that it should be in section 6. The minister gave his reasons for not permitting that, but I think the real flaw is that he is attempting, and the government is attempting, in section 17 to pin down in the detail, as they see it, in their interpretation of these words, precisely what the arbitrator will undertake.

So with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a subamendment, moved by myself, that all the words after "manage" in the third line be deleted. I would so move it, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to the motion.

Mr. Chairman: I will just place the motion.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I'm sorry.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. R. F. Nixon moves a subamendment that all words after the word "manage" in the third line of section 17, subsection 1, be deleted The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Reference has been made two or three times to the fact that I quoted from what was written into a private sector collective bargaining agreement.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is going to tell us now what it is, eh?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did that on two or three occasions and I admit it, simply to indicate to the House that there was a parallel for writing into a collective agreement, or in this instance into legislation, certain functions that were exclusively the right of management.

Mr. Deans: Surely, the minister has been pursuaded that is wrong.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Please, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I cannot say that at any time, nor can any member of the House say, that they heard me mention that it was intended to be the pattern for the bill. I did recite it as an example, and I think it was an apt example, of the fact that it is not exclusive to the bill which is under discussion here today.

Mr. Lewis: What apt example? Does the private sector contract eliminate the right to strike?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let that be as it may.

Mr. Lewis: How else do you feel management should refer to itself?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I say to you, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to do it, I am trying to respond to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition at this point in time.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Words of wisdom!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, they are not infrequently some words of wisdom. I am quite prepared to admit that. I don't have to be reminded of it, as a matter of fact.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Sometimes you do.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, sometimes I do. Sometimes I fail to see it. But I think I would have to take issue with the Leader of the Opposition that there has been an element of intransigence evident here, other than the fact that I made reference to the appellation applied to me by the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Martel: It really bothers the minister, doesn't it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I feel that he revels in it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I say to the hon. member, he is quite wrong on that contention—quite wrong!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't think so.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He is quite wrong. Again, and this might not be considered pertinent—

Mr. Deans: The minister is not very convincing.

Mr. Lewis: But he has a small memo prepared by his staff he would like to read into the record.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I'm not going to read a small memo into the record. No I am not.

Mr. Lewis: A lengthy statement.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was squaring up a host of papers. I am going to suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I have already said he may not find it pertinent, but what we are writing into this bill, in terms of exclusion, varies slightly, if at all, from what is written into the federal legislation in this respect.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You're right, it's irrelevant.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well then—

Mr. Singer: You are comparing apples to oranges.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It hasn't always been irrelevant in this House, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: The federal legislation does not rule out the right to strike.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think with some consistency, I say I think with some consistency—

Mr. Singer: You are consistently irrelevant.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well that almost disarms me completely, I will have to tell you, Mr. Chairman. I find that almost totally disarming.

But I came back, and call it intransigence if you wish, I am convinced, or I wouldn't be in this House saying I am convinced, that these exclusions that are written into section 17, in the initial stages of a piece of legislation that in my opinion is a landmark, a watershed, if you wish—

Mr. Deans: Millstone is a better word!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —because it's new, totally new, are a requirement.

Mr. Lewis: A landmark and a watershed. It is quite a bill!

Mr. Cassidy: Submerged, is that right?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I believe we will find it to be a landmark; and I am convinced that it is a requirement at this stage of our deliberations in this Legislature.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that if my opinions are not shared by everybody in this Legislature, then of course there's nothing very novel about that.

Mr. Deans: You are normally wrong.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the minister that, even more than the right to strike which is denied the civil servant, this section is going to have more repercussions than any other section. We are dealing with a society which gets increasingly better educated, Mr. Minister, and wants to have the right to discuss. This is coming, for example in the teachers' federation, where they are no longer satisfied just to discuss salaries but want to discuss job classifications and the terms of work and so on, and it is going to become a major issue in the teaching profession. I suggest, Mr. Minister, that there are more ways that the civil servant is going to be able to get at you through this bill, and in this particular clause, than enough. I can well recall when I worked at that great company called Inco when this sort of thing happened that somebody would drop a rail down a grizzle and tie up a machine for three days—because you've got to have a way.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Martel: You've taken away every avenue for these people to engage in meaningful dialogue. You have left them nothing.

Mr. Cassidy: Right, they are naked!

Mr. Martel: The right to strike is gone and the right to negotiate job classification and so on is gone. What have you really left them? Absolutely nothing!

I listen, you know, with interest, when I hear the "Hear, hears" from this side of the House. Why don't you bring a bill in, Mr. Minister, that would make some of the parasites in our society answerable to the public?

I have a daughter going to the orthodontist on Thursday—$1,175 for a nine-year-old girl. Why don't you bring that into line and make those people responsible to the public? You get at the civil servants who have some of the smallest salaries in Ontario!

Think of the hospital workers also. Why don't you go after some of those people, Mr.

Minister? I wonder how many Tory backbenchers would be "hear hear-ing" if you told the lawyers they had to negotiate, if you told the doctors they had to negotiate—

Mr. Deans: Have to go to arbitration.

Mr. Martel: —if you told the free-enterpriser, like the member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly), that he's got to negotiate his profit, that he simply can't name what he is going to make in terms of profit, maybe he wouldn't be here today "hear hear-ing."

Mr. Lawlor: You changed colour.

Mr. Martel: He might sit down and want to discuss in a meaningful manner what he can charge.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): I discuss it with my employees. There is not a member over there that has an employee—not one member who has employees.

Mr. Martel: All I'm saying is if you had to negotiate it—

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Oh, you have never worked a day in your life.

Mr. Martel: I suggest to you, if you had to negotiate it you'd be taking a different position today. If you had to negotiate with the government the way you run your business you'd be here screaming your innards out, my friend.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They never worked a day in their life.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): When your secretaries earn the same rate as those in the NDP caucus, you can talk.

Mr. Reilly: I would like to learn business from any one of you in a business over there.

Mr. Lewis: All the people over there have never taken a payroll down Main St.

Mr. Reilly: Did you ever see a payroll, Stephen?

Mr. Martel: I suggest, Mr. Minister, you might tell the doctors that they have to negotiate a pay increase. And, oh, would they be screaming their innards out, wouldn't they, Doc? Right. You'd be screaming your innards out and you wouldn't be "hear hear-ing" the minister at all.

Some of the lawyers, if they had to negotiate wouldn't be very happy. And I don't see you bringing that type of bill in, because you wouldn't get support in your own party. But you can get at the civil servant and you can deny him the right to strike, you can deny him the right to negotiate, and as I said earlier, leaving this government in charge of superannuation—if they do anything like they did with the teachers' superannuation—that would be like having Dracula in charge of the blood bank, because they have kept it actuarily non-sound for the last 50 years.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, that if you want trouble that clause is going to give you more than you can handle, a helluva lot more.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: If these people are so much in favour of it—I hear another lawyer reverberating in the building; maybe he'll introduce a private member's bill suggesting lawyers have to negotiate.

Mr. D. R. Irvine (Grenville-Dundas): Thank you for the compliment.

Mr. Martel: Well, some other profession—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I suggest to you that there would be a different attitude here tonight if they were the ones in this position.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I am asking the minister, in view of the changing trend that people want to have the right—it is interesting that when we discussed another bill in this House, one of his colleagues said, "You have to negotiate safety." Here he is, a couple of months later, saying, "No, we'll tell you what's right."

Can't you on that side of the House even get together on what you negotiate? You've got the Minister of Mines and so on saying, "You must negotiate safety;" another Minister of Mines said, "No, you can't," and here you are tonight saying that you will tell the workers what is right for them.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, in the strongest way that this is a poor section. In view of the fact that you have taken away the right to strike, you should at least give the workers—pretty trustworthy workers, I suggest, over the past number of years—the right to negotiate their jobs. I don't think that is asking too much of the minister. You still have the prerogative to say no and it goes to arbitration. I would ask the minister to reconsider this section 17.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of brief points to help con-

vince the minister to make up his mind to accept the amendment, the subamendment. This section will be very inoperative and very frustrating both to the employees who are bargaining on behalf of the other employees and to the tribunal who have to work under this section.

The first points are those that have been enunciated very clearly, where you use the term "contrary to the governing principles and standards." The minister did not answer the member for Wentworth on what he meant by that terminology. I might remind the minister that if he had been looking at other contracts over the years he would've found that those terms were usually in the sense of normal procedures, precedents and usual happenings.

I've seen all three of them in collective bargaining and over the years they had to be removed because of the confusion and the insensibilities of that terminology. Everyone, even the negotiator, was trying to decide what they meant, particularly an arbitrator when he had those words before him. You'll have the same kind of problem if you ever have to arbitrate under that section.

The first thing the arbitrator is going to ask both sides is "What is your interpretation of and what do you mean by the terms 'the governing principles and standards'?" That's going to be the hangup.

The second point I'd like to make for the minister's consideration is that the grievance procedures he outlines here apply only to the single employees. That, again, will frustrate the employees in their efforts to correct anomalies or grievances in any of the various functions of management, work methods, assignments and classifications and what-have-you. Invariably, they affect more than one employee.

What happened in the general run of collective bargaining with this type of clause was they would have to serve up to—in one case that I recollect—500 single grievances over the one happening. And you will face the same thing under this clause. So at least we should provide, and it has been provided in many updated agreements, that they can grieve for an employee or a group of employees, or for the union as a whole, on a policy matter affecting the union as a whole; and it can also go to arbitration in that sense. So there are two points that will render this section inoperative in every sense of the word, if it is left as it is.

Mr. Chairman: Does any other member wish to speak before we put the subamendment?

The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, on the amendment and subamendment: I sometimes sort of confront the government on things, Mr. Minister and certainly I think there is very good reason to do so in this case. But I would like to take a slightly different approach. In fact, the members from my party have already given a number of very good reasons, which I endorse, why the amendment and subamendment should be passed; and why this particular clause is wrong—approaching it from the standpoint of the responsibilities of the employer in having meaningful collective bargaining.

But in fact, what this section 17 says is three things. It says, first, that it is the exclusive function of the employer to manage—and then it goes on to elaborate on that. Then it says that these matters will not be the subject of bargaining. Then it says that they won't come within the jurisdiction of a board.

What concerns me in fact is the first statement—it is the exclusive function of the employer to manage. I took the minister's advice and called for a copy of report six of the COGP and had another look at that; just in order to see what is said in there.

The minister perhaps gilds the lily a bit in stating the enlightened elements in this particular report. It is mainly a report devoted to the management level within the public service and it seems to concern itself less with the people who are performing most of the jobs within the public service. There seems to be almost a class system implied here.

Nevertheless, the fundamental principle contained in the conclusion, is the idea that manpower planning, career planning, development and training should be encouraged to offer scope to people—particularly younger people—interested in building a career around the government service. They talk about proposed decentralizing of responsibility, of much improved communications between managers and employees. In fact, when it gets specific their talk in this report relates to quite a number of the things that are exclusive functions of the employer according to clause 17. In fact, after this bill is passed and suppose somebody does enter into the public service and begins to take an interest in their own personal development and the

way things work around the place; and so they say:

"Well, I was a member of a union before; can we strike?" The answer is no. "Well, what happens when you negotiate?" The answer is: "Well, if we can't reach an agreement it goes to arbitration. Next question: "Well who appoints the arbitration board?" The answer: "The government appoints two out of the three on the arbitration board." The question is, when presented with this particular clause: "What can we bargain about?" And then: "What happens if I've lodged a grievance?" The answer: "Well, it goes to public service grievance board." Another question: "How is that appointed; is it one for me and one for them and one in the middle?" The answer: "No, all three are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council."

In other words, if he looks at it from that point of view, everything is stacked in the government's favour and stacked away from the employee.

Now, it talks in here about having consultations, discussions and that sort of thing with the employees over a number of serious items. For example, recommendation 7.10 states that:

> A co-ordinated effort should be made to assist employees by providing opportunities through which they can participate in planning their career paths.

Now that is good modern management kind of talk. But when you get down to it, what you are saying in this clause to that employee? When he cares to look into it, it is that those consultations or discussions, as you chose to call them, can't really in the end be meaningful because management holds to itself the ultimate right to say, "Okay, you go to Moosonee and if you don't like it, that's it," or "You stick around on this job for another five years and then we'll consider promoting you." We will not give an inch. If this employee and that employee become dissatisfied with the career planning that's going for people in their particular grade or their particular department and choose to try to work collectively, in order to have more influence on the management within the government, of course, they find their way barred because of this exclusivity and the exclusion from collective bargaining.

The recommendation for a simplified classification system states specifically that: "The rate at which the classification system could be simplified would depend on factors such as consultations with the bargaining agents." One assumes that means with the unions that are involved. I do not see how the consultations which this document calls for can have meaning when they are excluded from the collective agreement and when they are also laid down as the exclusive function of management. What kind of consultation is that?

It states as well that, "putting the salary structure, which is a subject for bargaining, together with the new classification system, wouldn't be an easy process for obvious reasons." And they mention one of them, "because of the need to negotiate with the bargaining agents on some aspects of this important improvement." The committee says it's an improvement! How on earth can the bargaining agent, the CSAO or whatever union that is involved, sit down with the Management Board, the employer, to negotiate salary scales that relate to classifications without creeping over into the area which, according to this thing, is exclusively the function of the employer?

I say very seriously to the minister that some of these comments I've made reflect, if you will, the things that have been said by my party. But the other ones, I suggest, are a bit different. That is, the minister is surely aware of the new concepts of management, of the problem of alienation in the work situation, of new techniques of organization such as management grids and things like that, in which people don't just get paid, because if you could just pay them and say everything else is up to us, as management, you're bound to be paying more and getting worse service, less commitment to the job, less of the quality of work that one would like to see from the public service of Ontario.

The new philosophies are, in fact, to try to involve employees in their work. That means to involve them in the decision-making surrounding their work. And that means, among other things, that they feel they have a meaningful role to play in questions such as those that are specified here as the exclusive right of management.

You may say that it is in your philosophy to reject certain things proposed by our party because you feel you've gone far enough or something like that. Or basically because you endorse the 19th century concept of collective bargaining. But I'd suggest that the minister and his government have

done their best to come to terms with 1970 styles of management in terms of personnel classification, the way you organize the government and this sort of thing. We may not think you've done a particularly good job, but at least you're trying.

I would suggest that on those grounds, and on the need to actually involve your employees, you make it clear to them that they can be involved, that they will be consulted meaningfully, that if the consultation doesn't work that they can bring it up on the bargaining table if the other processes don't work. If you don't do that, then in fact you're simply reverting to 19th century styles of management in terms of the people in the public service, the people who you say are the greatest resource of the provincial government of Ontario.

I would really suggest very strongly to the minister for these reasons, which he may find philosophically easier to accept than others put forward by our party, as well as for the reasons that we have put forward, that he withdraw this clause.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to make just a few brief remarks on this section.

I've had representations from four different groups of civil servants in my own riding, calling upon me to oppose this restrictive section and to call for fair negotiation of a number of subjects that were in the old provisions and are being excluded in this section of the Act. I feel that this is a throw-back to some period where labour relations were not on as reasonable and responsible a basis as they have come to be in many parts of today's society. I feel that the civil servants of this province have been a responsible body and have served the people well, have been reasonable in their requests, have not been rash, or hasty, or arbitrary in their approach to problems and their working conditions and their own destiny, and I feel that this bill, in excluding so many things and making them the prerogative solely of management, is a step back and will not promote the good relationships between management and the civil servants that one would hope would be fashioned in a bill of this nature.

I might say, through you Mr. Chairman to the member for Eglinton, that while I don't employ people I do know a little bit about human relations and I know a little bit about justice and this kind of thing, and I feel when you involve people in an aspect of decision-making that directly concerns them, and you show some respect for their ideas, you do develop a better relationship.

And I would feel that by excluding so many things that are pertinent to the lives of these people on which they work, on which they live in terms of transfers and so on, that you are taking away something that is so vital to their whole life-style and their whole meaning and destiny that I think it is unfair—I think that these sections, as they are in the bill, and you propose to leave them in the bill, are restrictive and they are not in the interests of good employer-employee relations in this province.

I hope, but I am afraid nonetheless, that it is not going to promote as good relationships in the future as we have known in the past with the civil servants—I just feel that they are a group of people who deserve better than you are providing for them in this bill.

I feel that had you seen fit to allow them to negotiate some of these things in a meaningful way that you would find they would act responsibly in the future as they have in the past and that you would be as impressed, maybe more so, with their mature, responsible, approach to their work and to their interest in their work and their commitment to their work, if you would allow them to act, as I think they would in a mature fashion.

This is an age of dialogue where people want to have the opportunity to discuss their destiny, to work out in their own minds justification for doing what they are doing, and I think to take a paternalistic approach to them and tell them this is the way it has got to be and you have got to carry on in this way, is a throw-back to a day that is, I had hoped, long past. It seems as though we are bringing it up again and we are enshrining it in legislation and I think that we are creating problems for ourselves that need not be.

So I, along with other people in this caucus, but especially because of the groups of civil servants in my own riding who have asked me to oppose these sections, I am expressing my views and I am going to vote against this section.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I won't speak long on this matter, but having spent a considerable number of hours in committee, where one's nostrum and wisdom is not kept written in blocks of stone for future generations, I think one perhaps has earned a few moments of the time of the House to look askance at and to take some issue with this particular section. I probably won't talk on any other. This is the hub of the wheel upon which the rest of this legislation turns and, to express it in other words, taking section 25, the no-strike clauses, into consideration, this is the added insult to the injury—the injury being the strike, of course, and the insult being the section involved—in its range and its authoritarian tone.

During the committee hearings, I did move that after the word "organization" a period be inserted and the rest of subsection 1 be deleted, which pretty well accomplishes the same purpose as in intended by the hon. Leader of the Opposition tonight. Of course, I was a minority of one on that particular occasion, but I anticipated that.

It would seem to me that, having taken away the right to strike, that the managerial functions clause ought to be dealt with with considerable sauvity; that the government in order in some way to make up for the inflicted pain would see it in its own interests and in terms of good governmental relations, particularly with its own employees, to bend over backwards in terms of dialogue, in terms of leaving open for consultation and the give and take of advice, as wide a swath as is humanly possible. On the contrary, they write in here definitive clauses to the tune of about 22 subheads which arrogate rights exclusively to the government. By the time the legislation has had its full impact, the employee is virtually stripped of bargaining power and potential.

The government was able to get the first part, the striker aspect, into being because of the climate of opinion in the land these days. It was able to hit while the iron was hot, because of the conditions and the anti-labour sentiment which has been stirred and provoked by the press by and large and by ensconced conservative governments. That added to the conflagration and the feelings that were generated out of the Quebec situation. In that particular context, it was a relatively easy thing for this government and it moved quickly into the area and utilized the maximal public opinion in order to bring legislation.

May I join with some other members in this House in saying that presentations thus far—and the time has passed—by and large made to the committee and to us as members by the people who are deeply affected in this matter have been fairly perfunctory in their impact. I think it should go on record that one would have anticipated a somewhat more incisive and even more petulant form of argument, considering the weight of the rights being taken away; but such is not the case.

Members of the opposition or the members of the government who feel strongly about these matters must really receive considerable backing from the individuals who are most directly involved. If they do not rise to the occasion, how can they expect the representatives of a wider multitude of the people of very diverse interests to come to their aid?

But nevertheless, there are context and crux situations that arise where one has to speak in the teeth of the people who are unwilling or unable or, for some reason, do not speak for themselves.

When an injury in a clause that goes to the extent of this one is brought before us, then there is some obligation to be heard, because there will be a future coming in of the boats on the water, and this clause will fall under severe demarcation. It was argued at one point during committee that a clause, for instance, any one of these heads, may appear to be the exclusive jurisdiction of the government itself, and that it may arbitrarily indicate that it had no intention of bargaining. But that doesn't foreclose the issue, that most situations are sufficiently cloudy or ambiguous to permit the impact or the cross-sectioning of section 6 running contrary to section 17—with which we are dealing—or the arising of any number of situations unenvisionable as we stand here, which would send the matter on for arbitration, and would involve the tribunal along the way and possibly the writing of clarifying clauses into the collective agreement itself. That may be so, but surely if the government takes an adamantine stand under a particular head here and says that is a matter of classification, or a matter of job evaluation; that is the end of the matter, we won't negotiate it, we will set down our criteria and our rules—that is the end of it.

I would think that even if the union disputed that on however ostensibly valid grounds and if it reached the tribunal, the tribunal would feel itself foreclosed on the basis of the clause as set forth. They would say "Regrettable as the legislation may be now in its impact, however confining as it

may be on our rule of discretion, the fact of the matter is it does appear to fall within—"

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Is the hon. member reading all that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Lawlor: "—say the question of a merit system." That is the end of the matter and it cannot go any further with it. That argument has very little impact or validity. The matter is foreclosed and usurped and taken out of the hands of the employee. Why, even on so simple a thing, let's say, as work methods and procedures or the technicological clause—kinds and location of the equipment—can you imagine—

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, is the hon. member on the bill or is he giving us a—

Mr. Lawlor: Are you still up in Rainy River?

Mr. Reid: Did I just come in from Rainy River? Can't you hear?

Mr. Lawlor: Still being snowed on? Certainly, under the clause—

Mr. Reid: I just came in from fighting fires.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. Lawlor: Will you rule on that, please, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I said the member for Lakeshore had the floor.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you very much.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Is he on the bill or off the bill?

Mr. Lawlor: You wouldn't know, would you?

Mr. Reid: No. With all due respect to the member for Lakeshore it is not his competence that I call into question; I just wonder if the Chairman knows what he is talking about?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore has the floor. Go ahead, proceed.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Your competence is of the very highest tonight; other people I find lacking. Now he has thrown me off my stride—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: I would just take another look at it.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Deans: Why don't you go back and start over?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Go back to the beginning.

Mr. Stokes: I suggest to the member for Rainy River if he has got nothing to say, please don't say it.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex-South): He does it so effectively though.

Mr. Lawlor: If would be a terrible thing to have to wind up again and to reach the same conclusion after all that very trenchant reasoning that went into the thing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You mean you have to go back over the same ground again to pick up where you left off?

Mr. Lawlor: I'm speaking to you, Mr. Chairman, and not to the minister. The minister has already indicated that his pride of intransigence, a certain obstinancy in his Scots nature, reigns in the matter.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Pride of purpose.

Mr. Lawlor: He knows what is best for this province. He is not in the Management Board for nothing by Lord. He'll put down his heels upon the face of the civil servants—

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest that the member for Lakeshore get back to section 17.

Mr. Lawlor: You think I may be off the point now?

Mr. Reid: Now you are doing your job, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ferrier: He was saying something good about the Scots!

Mr. Lawlor: I was just mentioning what a silly thing it would be, under the clause of kinds and location of equipment, if the employees in a particular department felt that the adding machine should be on the south wall and the hon. minister thought it should be on the north, that he should usurp the privileges of argument about the exact location. Surely he could reach a compromise and put the thing in the middle of the room or something.

That is the kind of triviality which we may very well fall into and that you, by your

actions and arbitrariness in the course of this kind of legislation, cannot help but bring about. I am terribly disappointed that a fiercer battle wasn't raised over these matters; that you didn't encounter far rougher opposition as you should have encountered under contemporary concepts in bargaining. You have been able to—I know it is intolerable to have to listen over this stretch of time in this regard, but if the matter were properly handled you would be here for several more weeks, in my considered judgement, in face of what is happening in contemporary times with legislation of this kind. One has no hope of persuading—the minister has seen through the secrets of the universe, he has come to final definitive conclusions—and Charles has not been known to be a great budger on the best of occasions—and with that in mind, having said what I can on behalf of the civil servants of the province, I sit down.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Atta boy, Pat.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the amendment?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am.

Mr. Chairman: Subamendment!

Mr. Deans: Whoa!

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I only have two things to say on the bill. You know, legislative assemblies used to fight tooth-and-nail and some of the best fights of an assembly of this nature were to curtail the feudal prerogatives of the Crown, but we are reduced in this Legislature to being asked to entrench in a bill a feudal prerogative of the Crown. The government over many years has reduced the civil service of the Province of Ontario to a structure that is not capable of even tangling with the government about the iniquities of a clause such as this is in this bill.

The minister must very well know that the prerogatives of the Crown, by and large, are not to be entrenched but the prerogatives of the Crown are to be made subject to the will and wishes of the people in the province. And it is not the will and wish of the people of the Province of Ontario that a management rights clause should be entrenched in this bill in a form which would have done justice to the managerial rights of the late Mr. Carnegie or one of the robber barons of the empire builders of the United States or of Great Britain.

A bill such as this, which endeavours to try to improve the relationships between the Crown and those in its employ, cannot be possible—it cannot be possible for such a bill to contain in it a clause such as this clause and, as I said when the bill was on second reading, it is the incapacity of the government, to understand the collective bargaining process, which leads it into the contradiction which is inherent in this clause, because the minister's answer was that we cannot as government give up our right to govern. Those were the terms which were used. We cannot give it up to a board which is going to determine, as a matter of compulsory arbitration, matters which are the prerogative of government.

The reason the government can't give it up is because it has chosen to call, by the term "collective bargaining", a process which is not collective bargaining, but a process which simply is for compulsory arbitration. And since you cannot give it up to a board, then we come back to the fundamental principle that the contradiction is that the bill should not have taken away the right to strike, because management's function has been a function of evolution. Matters which were within the purview of management and within the sole purview of management years ago are no longer recognized in modern industrial relations to be matters solely within the prerogative of management. And here we have the minister reinforcing by the term such as the "exclusive", the terms "with which function without limiting the generality of the foregoing shall include about 15 or 16 enumerated heads"—he is reinforcing a conception of management which will not allow for the evolution of those very essential ingredients of management relations which involve the cooperation and the support of those who are employed by the government.

The minister always thinks of the collective bargaining process only in terms of its end result, and that is a strike where management and labour are at total loggerheads. That is the conception of this government, and they consider that to be the reason they should move in every conceivable way to curtail that particular opposition from developing, when it should fully and reasonably understand that the legitimate matters which

are of concern to the employees under a true collective bargaining system can be solved by the collective bargaining process, that the function of management can evolve, and that the legitimate elements of management as distinct from the legitimate elements of government can be distinguished and those matters of management which relate to the work place in which the employees are engaged and fulfil their function can also be distinguished from those matters which should be exclusively within the prerogative of management.

The collective bargaining process is not some sterile opposition of warring and opposing factions. It is a condition of the evolution of the kind of bureaucracies which can evolve in such a way to have some element of concern for those who participate and have to earn their living within those bureaucracies. But if the minister insists on structuring a bureaucracy in this way, he leaves little, if any, room for the evolution of intelligent perceptions of the problems of those who are in the employ of the government.

Many other flaws have been indicated in debate in the other clauses of the bill, all of which reflect in this particular clause, and the minister will not give consideration to the proposition that it is possible for representatives, even the entrenched representative granted the monopoly that the CSAO has been granted by this bill, to negotiate in good faith with government and still have the reserve right to strike if they wish to strike but to permit for the evolution of the function of government in such a way that it will evolve in a modern intelligent, worth while way.

It's not just up to the minister to say, "Well now, we will allow the civil service to do certain marginal things but, as has been the case in the past, they will depend on us for our good judgement and our wisdom about matters of fundamental importance." The matters of fundamental importance are entrenched in this bill as part of management rights because those are the real areas that determine the kinds of conditions which will exist at the work place.

The minister allows only bargaining with respect to those matters which traditionally he knows have got to be agreed with the employees, because otherwise there will be no civil service in the province simply because economic factors will lead people to choose their employment elsewhere.

If one looks, as we tried to look at the provisions of section 6 of the bill, one finds that those were elements that the government had to move without any collective bargaining process of any significance simply to keep pace with the private sector in the economy. It knew very well that the hours of work, the provisions for overtime and the benefits that accrued by way of group insurance and other benefits in the welfare package that goes with the collective bargaining process had to be granted because otherwise there would have been an erosion of the civil service into the private sector, or the quality of the civil service would have been seriously affected.

But when it comes to the matters which are of immediate, modern, everyday concern about the kind of life that a person leads for the seven or eight hours of his daily employment and a substantial part of his working life, we have the minister dig his heels in and simply say, "Oh no, this particular feudal structure will continue. We will not allow the prerogatives of the Crown to be challenged, let alone challenged by our employees whom we want to maintain in a position of feudal vassalage to the Crown. The minister knows this is right, because for many, many years the prerogatives of the Crown with respect to who could sue it were matters which stayed on as an anachronism year in and year out, when people knew that there should be no longer those anachronisms within the government circle. Yet, when we come to this clause, we see another anachronism enshrined in legislation, and we're being asked in this party to support that particular provision in the bill and entrench a feudal doctrine which has no place in a modern society whatsoever.

We are, therefore, constrained, and have to be constrained, to vote against the bill. The reason is that the government will find that the system which it believes is going to improve the bargaining process in government with the civil service is, in fact, going to do the opposite. The very matters which are going to be fought by an alive and alert, I hope, Civil Service Association, if that is now possible, are the very matters which are the tooth and nail and the real substance of the collective bargaining process throughout the country.

As for most of the other items, that is, wages and welfare benefits and the other fringe benefits of traditional collective bargaining, many of them have been won, or the procedures for determining the outcome of those decisions have already been estab-

lished. But so far as these matters which are reserved to the government are concerned, they are the very ones which, for any members of the civil service wanting to bargain as a group to improve their position, are matters with which they are vitally concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, for those reasons, I certainly along with my colleagues here, will oppose the bill and vote for the amendment which has been introduced.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I have just a couple of remarks. First of all, why can't the minister set an example for employers in this province? Why does he have to hide behind the power of his steamroller majority in the House here to pass labour legislation that I don't think he would place in general labour law? I can't imagine him trying to put this through in other labour legislation, because I know he would find that the majority of the people in this province wouldn't be behind him. There would be an outcry the like of which he hasn't heard since the police bill of a former Attorney General a few years ago aroused the people of this province. Surely he recognizes that employees can make a significant contribution to better management, given the right sort of atmosphere. This cowardly, autocratic approach, which shows the outdated attitude of this minister, is something he will always be ashamed of, and so will this House.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, do you want to reply.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a couple of brief questions. What discussion and consultation precisely were there with the Civil Service Association of Ontario about the substance of clause 17? How did that discussion take place? When did it take place; over how many meetings; at what level was the participation; and was there such participation at all?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I will have to find out what meetings preceded the one that I participated in myself. The one that I have particular knowledge of was held in the board room of the Management Board a week or ten days prior to the introduction of the legislation. There have been meetings with staff prior to that, but I am not aware of the numbers of the meetings and the locations. That information can probably be on my desk. I see it's coming to me now.

Mr. Lewis: Right. May I ask you, preliminary to your receiving the information from your aides under the gallery, can you tell me what was the nature of the discussion in your boardroom 10 days or so prior to the legislation coming in? What were the views expressed by the Civil Service Association about section 17?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, if my recollection serves me correctly, the Civil Service Association representatives, which included the president and some of the executives, expressed the concern that one would expect from them about sections 6 and 17. A discussion ensued and during the discussion, obviously myself, and those who are in my employ for this purpose, presented the other side of the case. Details were not recorded, to my knowledge, but it was the type of normal discussion which I think everybody would expect. From there, it was proceeded with in terms of introduction, to second reading in this House and then to standing committee as the hon. member is aware.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Actually, I wouldn't have thought it to be characterized as the normal discussion which anyone would expect. I would have thought it to be heated momentarily, perhaps a twitch of resentment or intemperate response now and again. Was the association not strong and vocal in its views about section 17? I just don't know. I have no idea. But I am genuinely curious.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman. I would have to say, if the hon. member is expecting me to say that there was a rousing, rip-snorting, roaring, vocal confrontation, I would have to say no. I would have to say that I am not too sure that type of confrontation is the best type of confrontation in any case. I thought the discussions were good. Points were made. Some suggestions were pursued and subsequently acted upon. There were amendments to the bill in committee. Now from there on, I am not going to say it characterized a rousing, noisy, blustering session.

Mr. Lewis: No, I didn't call for that. I just wanted to get a sense of whether there was any feeling on either side.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I would have to say there was some feeling obviously expressed—but in sound, quiet, sensible terms.

Mr. Lewis: Sound, quiet, sensible expression of feeling. I guess that is pretty comfortable in the board rooms of the Management Board?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I don't know whether it is sensible or not—

Mr. Lewis: Did you amend the section between the time that you met with the Civil Service Association personally and the time that you introduced the bill into the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Some proposals for amendment were discussed and, if my memory serves me correctly, there were some amendments written into the legislation prior to being dealt with in the committee stage in the standing committee.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, but not dealing with this section?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, not dealing with this section.

Mr. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no!

Mr. Deans: This was too important to amend?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say there were some amendments made to section 6 in committee.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, in committee, I know.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —and certain amendments to section 17 (2).

Mr. Lewis: Right! May I ask you, is there anything in the note which has been handed to you which is pertinent?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, quite.

I would say that at the request of the government, two full meetings were held in the fall and winter of 1971 between senior officials of the Department of Civil Service and CSAO; the discussions were very free and frank as to what the bill should contain. I wasn't at those meetings. I can only assume that what's been stated here characterizes the quality and conduct of the meetings that took place.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Mr. Lewis: Okay, that answers the first series of relatively brief questions that I wanted to ask, Mr. Chairman.

I want to ask now, if I could, a number of brief questions about the actual prescriptions in section 17, just to elicit from the minister, again in brief, certain reasons. Could the minister perhaps explain once again—it was done in the context of section 6, but I would appreciate it being done in the context of section 17—I understand why he may think it is difficult, but why does he think it is impossible for the civil service of Ontario to have a role in the negotiation of superannuation?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest the answer is that, apart from the fact that the government administers more than one pension plan, I still believe, as I believed at the outset, that it is one of the exclusive rights of management where the public service is involved.

Mr. Deans: Pensions?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: You do?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I do.

Mr. Deans: You're kidding!

Mr. Lewis: Well, one of the things which you are kind enough to leave in section 6 is the question of paid holidays, paid vacations, group life insurance, health insurance, and long-term income protection insurance, all of which lies within the general frame of the collective bargaining process known as fringes, and absolutely integral with which are normally matters of pension benefits.

I mean there are, in fact, very few contracts which preclude from the employees the right to discuss the percentage for pension benefits, and how much the employer contributes, and how much the employee contributes, and how superannuation is built on. Given that it is in some measure a public plan, but given also that these other things are—OHIP is as well, and you manage to arrange that—what is it about pensions especially? I mean, what is it about this —which most people feel is the most crucial point about the collective bargaining process —which would remove it from the rights of discussion?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Briefly, Mr. Chairman — I have already expressed our views. The government administers, let's say, the Pension Benefits Act. It administers the OMERS Act; it administers the public service superannuation fund; it administers the

teachers' superannuation fund, and numbers of these things. So in the total context we feel then, and I hope rightly, that superannuation should—and that's why the legislation is written this way—be a matter that is exclusively the right of management.

Mr. Deans: That's just awful, it really is.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I don't need a nose turned up at me, or an injured face—

Mr. Deans: I cannot help it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —because it's simply a matter of opinion.

Mr. Lewis: It is clearly a matter of opinion and it is also clearly a matter on which your opinion will prevail. But during the course of the period when we had Ontario Health Insurance and Ontario Hospital Insurance, it was possible for you, as a government, to combine benefits under each for your employees. For whatever reason, you have removed the rights to bargain around superannuation, which is really, as my colleague from Windsor West pointed out, the most gross violation in this entire clause, God knows the clause is objectionable enough as it stands, but removing the right to superannuation is really, really beyond the payoff in collective bargaining procedure.

Let me ask you, Mr. Minister—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! All these questions to my knowledge have been asked before. They have been asked several times this evening; it is becoming very repetitious.

Mr. Lewis: They have been discussed from different vantage points, some of them fully, some of them not so fully. I choose to deal with those that I thought were not discussed as fully.

Mr. Chairman: It seems quite repetitious; the same questions and the same answers.

Mr. Cassidy: We are still hoping the minister will change his mind.

Mr. Lewis: The answers, as a matter of fact, were slightly different, which shows the minister's capacity for artfulness, if not mine, Mr. Chairman.

May I ask the minister, through the chair: Why is it that you would deny your employees the right to negotiate around layoff? There are only four subjects I want to deal with and all will be enumerated. Why not around layoff?

I mean, it is the man's job. It is the woman's job. It is their life, their economic life, which is at stake. Have they no rights in a collective bargaining agreement with the Crown which is supposed to set out some model legislation to discuss matters of layoff and how they would like it handled? Do you not think that would be fair?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would see certain problems associated with that which would then in turn, I would hope, support the right of management that has been claimed. I would turn the tables and ask the hon. member if the government, or the employers, should have the right to determine whether a programme is redundant, or whether it should be abandoned—

Mr. Martel: Absolutely, but you negotiate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —or a series of programmes. Would he say that that is an exclusive right of management or not?

Mr. Renwick: That's a matter of government, not management.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If the answer is in the affirmative, as I believe it should be, then it may be that certain members of staff become redundant in the process. Experience, I think, has shown everyone in the employ of the government—certainly it is being shown clearly and well now with the new structuring of government and the transfers and shifts that are taking place—that every effort is made to employ everyone that is employable in any sense of the word, by the process of transfer in some situations, where a job ceases to exist.

There are many examples of what I am discussing, Mr. Chairman, and I hardly think it needs any lengthy reiteration. But I'll just go back and repeat: that if the management —the government in this case—has the right to determine whether programmes are created, or if redundant ones are abandoned, then to an extent the right to determine dismissal—not in the normal terms of dismissals; shall we say layoff, transfer—certainly those things have to be the associated right of management.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Minister, I see you're hanging your hat strongly on the argument about the right to manage, and the interjection of my colleague from Riverdale was, I think, rather apt. What you are really talking about is the right to govern. If, as a matter of legislative or political policy, you decide—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I made that distinction in committee.

Mr. Renwick: Oh, you did not.

Mr. Bullbrook: Between management and government.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Bullbrook: They are two different things.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the intellectual prowess of the member for Sarnia often approximates that of the member for Riverdale, and—

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank you.

Mr. Lewis: I would certainly concede that it could have come from either.

But regardless of its origin, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Regardless of its origin, if you want to exclude an entire programme, presumably one of the branches or divisions or whatever, that's clearly a function of government; it was within your prerogative.

If you are redefining a programme; if you are bringing the Ontario Hospital Services Commission within the ambit of the government and the Department of Health, and in the process there is some job readjustment; then I would think that it is clearly the right of the employee to advance notice of a kind that a contractual guarantee would give, and to some discussion about potential layoff hazards; and that that should be part of the collective bargaining process.

The minister has a very constrained view of the way in which employees either will behave or should be treated. You talk so nonchalantly about transferring the employee, and doing your best. Well, damn it all, Mr. Minister, matters of collective bargaining are not matters of the government doing its best; they are matters of the inherent right of the employee—

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): You are getting very emotional.

Mr. Lewis: —to have a stake in what is considered best. And you have precluded that; you have removed that; you have simply said that in matters of layoff you have the sole prerogative. And you introduce a sort of paternalism into the collective bargaining situation for which civil servants will sorely suffer.

Let me ask you, Mr. Minister, what is it about discipline and termination of employment that you think you should remove from the employee? Do you not think that in good faith—and one assumes bargaining is in good faith—those are things which employees cannot participate in?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I was of the opinion we would find that the word "termination" was removed and that "dismissal and suspension" were substituted therefor.

Mr. Lewis: Well, all right; I don't mind which.

Mr. Deans: "Discipline and termination."

Mr. Lewis: "Discipline and termination" it says in my amended section. Maybe it isn't "amended."

Mr. Deans: No, that's "amended."

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I think I am reading the right section. It says, "discipline and termination of employment"—17, subsection one.

Mr. Deans: I raised that with you; "termination."

Mr. Lewis: What is it that is so exclusive about that? I mean, I am trying very hard to understand the reasoning for these prescriptive clauses. Or are you now finding that that's a clash with section 2(d)?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are quite right, it is section 2(d).

Mr. Lewis: It is section 2(d)?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That's where it was amended. That's quite correct.

Mr. Lewis: But it isn't amended in section 17(1)?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, it is amended here because it relates to the grievance procedures.

Mr. Lewis: All right, I see. But it doesn't include in the next section termination or discipline—or termination certainly, and I wondered why? Do you really feel that that cannot be an advance—some kind of discussion in advance with the employees about the way in which termination is handled? Don't you think that is a useful thing in collective bargaining procedures?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lewis: Well clearly you don't.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, ample provisions for grievance have been made in the bill. I suggest it shouldn't be quite the matter of concern that it appears to be for the hon. member. And where termination followed 17(1) onto page 17, subsection 2, clause (d), termination there was changed from "dismissal or suspension" to broaden the rights of grievance.

Mr. Lewis: Without just cause—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Right!

Mr. Lewis: —as my colleague points out to me, whereas termination should be something that is quite negotiable. If you want to set out a kind of contract to which the member for York Centre alluded, this is your opportunity to do it. The last thing I wanted to ask you, because it seems to me to be so inherently inconsistent and contradictory, is this business of the job evaluation system. Is it not one of those transparent truths that employees who have experienced the workplace are likely to know as much about and understand most fully the nature of the job, and to evaluate it accordingly? Why must that be an exclusive management prerogative?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think I have commented on that to the extent that is required.

Mr. Lewis: I want to make—just very, very briefly, Mr. Chairman—three or four comments that strike me from this entire debate. One, Mr. Chairman, although it may be inappropriate, I want to express disappointment—and I suspect that most colleagues in my caucus would approve it and will speak to it further in this bill—in the energy, submissions and purpose of the Civil Service Association of Ontario in pursuing the defence of the rights of its members as delineated or as denied by this legislation.

It may be that it is profoundly comfortable for the minister to have a CSAO which appears to be so extraordinarily acquiescent in the face of what any other employees' organization I know would consider a most extraordinary provocation. But the CSAO, for whatever reason, has accepted the proscriptions of this bill. We have received some telegrams and a few letters. It was pointed out to me that the galleries tonight are not entirely packed with members of the association anxious that their rights be preserved.

I don't know what it is about the CSAO, but it is a matter of some disappointment, and I shall leave it at that. I shall not pass judgement until later.

Now the other point I want to make, with great respect Mr. Chairman, is that it seems to us that the minister has taken little interest in the legislation, and knows relatively little about the legislation, and when pressed to defend a given clause or a given item he will do so in accustomed generality, but that he has not got at his command a series of illustrative examples.

He does not have at his hand a number of comparative contracts. He does not have at his hand comparisons made with legislation in other jurisdictions in this country, many of which jurisdictions are not nearly as confining as this. That in fact the minister in terms of this legislation is very relaxed, very comfortable, very uncaring, quite willing to bull it through without feeling that he has to be called to account.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The comments are not relative to the amendment.

Mr. Lewis: Third, Mr. Chairman, I want to express our sense of repugnance over this whole clause. This is the second worst clause in the entire bill. It is only exceeded by that clause which removes the right to strike from all employees arbitrarily and without distinction.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, just this word of caution to the minister. The minister wants this to stand clearly as a monument. He calls it a watershed and he calls it—what else did he call it?—a landmark. You mentioned quietly to your colleagues that you thought it was an Achilles heel but you wouldn't say that in the House. I will say it for you, because I know that underneath you really feel it! Underneath you feel the profound frailty of this bill.

It is simply this—that you are poisoning the collective bargaining process between the civil service and government in perpetuity with this legislation. What you are really going to have to do, in negotiation after negotiation, is either to invite the collective condemnation of the CSAO when they finally realize what they have relinquished, or you are going to have to bring down the mailed fist of government to drive them into line.

You cannot have reasoned, intelligent, quiet and effective collective bargaining, as this section now precludes it. It is not possible. It is absolutely not possible.

There is no group that in a tough collective bargaining situation—and they haven't yet bargained under this kind of prohibition—can acquiesce in silence when they realize that one right after another is surrendered; when you get arbitration board awards one after the other which will point to the fact that they haven't been able to exercise rights or judgements in this area or that area, because section 17 removed all of that and gave it as an exclusive managerial residual right.

It is beyond dictatorial! It goes right to the heart of collective bargaining as you see it in the public service. While it is impossible to make absolute predictions I am reminded of the succession of years when the member for Hamilton East and the former member for Woodbine met the various representatives of the government who defended the civil service or who were responsible for the Civil Service Commission. The bad faith in the bargaining process that was evident in those years is as nothing to what you are inviting in this bill.

You are doing it defiantly and you are doing it with intransigence. The minister is tough, obstinate, stubborn, intractable. He makes a fetish of it. Those are all just descriptive of the minister's conduct, not of the minister. I would never give a description of the minister, just of the attitude and the conduct as it conveys its way through this bill. It is a positive celebration of intransigence.

I don't understand what you intend to gain by it, because when your civil servants have to work within this Act, when it dawns on them the way in which you have tied their hands with your democratic paternalism, then you are inviting a great deal of trouble, Mr. Minister. I don't see why you are so intent on doing that. We accept, of course, the amendment that was made.

I may say, just to end on a note sufficiently unorthodox for the minister, so that it may set out carefully and comfortably in this House the divisions that separate us, we would like to have voted against the entire bill, because the New Democratic Party is not persuaded that it is even the exclusive prerogative of the Management Board to manage, that even there, there are employee rights in the management which could well have been shared in the negotiating process. We would have been prepared to vote against the entire clause, that section included.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions? The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in the debate at this time, but the debate preceding my very brief remarks has driven me to it. Unlike the leader of the Liberal Party, I have received about a dozen letters from my constituents, from members of the civil service, opposing the bill. I just want to read one of those into the record.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! We are not on the principle of the bill. That has been passed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: We are not talking about the bloody principle.

Mr. Foulds: I am opposing, Mr. Chairman, particularly section 17, the authoritarian nature—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! We are not on the principle of the bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: May I read the letter and then you can judge?

Mr. Chairman: Well, it seems to me that the bill—

Mr. Foulds: It's a two-sentence—a three-sentence letter.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. It seems to me your comments are on the principle of the bill and we will not allow it.

Mr. Lewis: Well, how do you know it is the principle?

Mr. Foulds: The letter reads: "I am writing to you re Bill 105, and especially with regard to clause 17 which the Conservative government is trying to pass."

Mr. Cassidy: Right on.

Mr. Martel: Right on the clause.

Mr. Ferrier: They are trying to muffle a good speech.

Mr. Lewis: I know there are only 50,000 civil servants involved. Tuck them in between 8 and 10:30.

Mr. Foulds: "It is my opinion," says this writer, "that it is nothing but communism. You are a fair man, Mr. Foulds. Will you protest Bill 105?" I do protest it, Mr. Chairman, not because the bill is an expression of communism—

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Now we know!

Mr. Foulds: — but because it is—and this clause particularly—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Somebody is mixed up.

Mr. Lawlor: The Chairman of the Management Board is a communist, by George!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That letter is worth reading.

Mr. Foulds: —an expression of injustice, of authoritarianism, of dictatorial arrogance, and that is what the writer of this letter meant when he used that term. I protest the bill in the most strong terms.

Mr. Ferrier: That was a wonderful speech.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question then? We have an amendment to section 17; we also have a subamendment to that amendment.

Mr. Martel: Watch all the seals. They haven't got the courage to oppose the Chairman of the Management Board.

Mr. Chairman: We will deal with the subamendment first and I will just repeat it:

Mr. Nixon in the subamendment had moved that all the words after the word "manage" in the third line of section 17, subsection 1, be deleted.

Those in favour of Mr. Nixon's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Shall we stack this vote along with any others that might ensue?

Mr. Lewis: If you would like to take the vote tomorrow, we are game.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

Order, please! All those in favour of Mr. Nixon's motion will please rise.

All those opposed will please rise.

The committee divided on the subamendment, which was negatived.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 25, the "nays" 49.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost.

Now we have the amendment as moved by Mr. Bounsall, that the word "superannuation" be removed from clause 17 (1) of Bill 105.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: There is no discussion on it. Ready for the motion?

Those in favour of Mr. Bounsall's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We will accept the same vote.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and that section 17 stands as part of the bill.

Any other comments, questions or amendments to any other later section of the bill?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I would like to say that tomorrow afternoon we will proceed with the consideration of Bill 105 in committee of the whole House, and the estimates of the Ministry of Community and Social Services will be heard by the standing committee.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before the motion to adjourn is put, I would

like to register a protest on behalf of this party here over the change in the estimates to be considered before the committee. This is the second change in three days, regarding the same committee and the same set of estimates.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It is a terrible thing.

Mr. Deans: We do feel, quite frankly, since we were informed on Friday that that particular committee would be hearing the Management Board, and since the Management Board is tied up in the House—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): The member is confused.

Mr. Deans: —that it would be better that the committee not sit tomorrow than to force the members who have commitments here in the House to attend on the committee.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear! Carried.

Mr. Deans: The Treasurer agrees?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:40 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 29, 1972

Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees, bill to provide for, in committee 2929

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 2959

Legislature of Ontario Debates:

No. 75



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 30, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again we are favoured with many visitors. Today in the east gallery we have students from Earl Beatty Public School of Toronto; and in both galleries, from Parklawn Public School of Toronto. At 3 o'clock we will have, in the west gallery, students from Green Briar Public School of Brantford; and in the east gallery from the J. E. Benson Public School of Windsor. Later in the afternoon, in both galleries, there will be students from Norwell District Secondary School of Palmerston.

Statements by the ministry.

PURCHASE OF COACHES FOR GO TRANSIT

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce to members of the House that the government has approved the purchase of 30 rail commuter coaches for GO Transit at a cost of $6 million.

The order has been placed with the firm of Hawker Siddeley Canada Ltd., and construction will be carried out at its Canadian Car division located at Thunder Bay. This is the same firm that provided the original coach equipment to launch the GO service operated along the Lakeshore, east and west of Toronto.

Twenty cars in this order will be used to launch an initial service around the middle of 1973 in the northwest corridor, with stops at Weston, Malton, Bramalea, Brampton and Georgetown. The 10 other cars will be assigned to the Lakeshore service to relieve rush-hour congestion on that system.

The new equipment will be the same as the original design and will provide passengers with a high level of comfort to make rail commuting as attractive as possible.

Each car will have a capacity for 94 seated riders and a provision for 36 standing riders. The interior will be a combination of relaxing wall colors, full-length milk-white translucent plastic ceiling panelling illuminated by concealed fluorescent lighting, and seats will be of the bucket-seat design.

Each car will be equipped with large scenic-view windows capable of reducing glare and heat penetration, and an air-conditioning and electric heating system that will maintain interior temperatures at approximately 70 deg.

End-loading, centrally controlled automatic doors will permit seat capacity loading in one minute.

Mr. Speaker, although I am sure most members are familiar with the type of equipment that I have described, I thought it would be in order to just refresh their memory on some of these features as the equipment, that was specially designed originally for GO Transit, generated widespread compliments from transportation experts who have visited here from all parts of the continent.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a remark made by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. White), who has been closely involved with this decision to place the order. The minister said:

> Placing the order with the only Ontario manufacturer of transit rolling stock, at an otherwise slack period which could have meant a shutdown and layoffs, means the Canadian Car division can continue as a viable industry that is important to the entire province.
>
> More specifically, through the continuing work for approximately 225 employees, it will have an important bearing on the Thunder Bay economy.

GOVERNMENT PLANE ACCIDENT

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): I wish, Mr. Speaker, to make a statement concerning a mishap yesterday involving a government aircraft at Kenora airport. The aircraft, a Beechcraft King Air, suffered damage to its propellors and undercarriage, and possible engine damage, when it failed to make a satisfactory landing at the Kenora airport.

Officials of the Ministry of Transport and my own ministry are still at the scene of the accident and are making an assessment of the causes of the mishap and the extent of the damage.

It appears that the landing gear of the aircraft failed to lock into place, although there was no indication to the pilots of mechanical failure prior to the accident.

This aircraft was engaged in the transport of government personnel to various points in northwestern Ontario as part of the government's firefighting programme over this past weekend.

I am, however, very happy to be able to inform the members of the House that no one aboard the aircraft sustained any injuries. When further details are available, I will be happy to report that information to the House.

FOREST FIRE SITUATION

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, in addition, I would like to report to the members of the House the extent of the forest fire situation in the province at this time.

As all members are aware, the unusually high temperatures and low humidity in many parts of the province in recent weeks has given rise to an exceptionally large number of forest fires.

To date, 780 fires have occurred in the province.

During the past 10 days from 40 to 69 fires a day were reported in northern Ontario, most of them as a result of lightning and other natural causes.

To reduce the incidence of fires resulting from other than natural causes, I imposed a restricted fire zone in the northeastern area of the province on May 24 and in the northwestern region on May 26.

In addition to regular firefighting personnel in my ministry, 1,500 additional firefighters were employed, many of them experienced Indian firefighters.

The government has also increased its own firefighting aircraft fleet by arrangements through our interprovincial mutual aid agreements. Over 20 helicopters, an A26 retardant fire bomber and several Canso water bombers were obtained from other provinces. Five senior firefighting personnel from the Province of Alberta also assisted us. All government aircraft, including the executive Twin Otter and the Beechcraft King Air were also involved in the work during this period.

However, I am pleased to report that rainfall since Sunday of from one-half to one-and-a-half inches throughout northern Ontario has resulted in a significant reduction in the forest-fire hazard. Continued rainfall throughout this region has further reduced the number of fires burning from 157 yesterday to only 97 today. Only four of these fires are presently listed out of control.

Despite the unusually large number of fires this spring, members will be pleased to learn that less than 40,000 acres of land have been affected. This, I believe, is a tribute to the skill of our firefighting teams and the effectiveness of our firefighting programme. It is too early to assess the damage on the timber reserves on this acreage.

I am also very pleased to report that, despite several mishaps, involving the loss of a government Beaver aircraft and an accident involving a leased helicopter, no member of my staff and no firefighter sustained any personal injury.

DEATH OF HRH DUKE OF WINDSOR

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members of the House will join me in expressing the sadness of the the government and the people of Ontario at the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Windsor. Many of our people will remember the affection and enthusiasm with which he was greeted on his several visits to Canada and this province.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, as Her Majesty's representative in Ontario, has already expressed the official condolences of the people of the province in a message to Queen Elizabeth. I am certain that all members would, likewise, wish to express their sympathy to Her Majesty, to the Duchess of Windsor, and to the members of the Royal Family. To make this possible, a book of condolences is available for signing by members of the House and all members of the public who may wish to pay their personal tribute to the memory of the late Duke, the former King Edward VIII.

The book of condolences is open for signatures in the lobby of the Lieutenant Governor's suite which, in this instance, is reached through the private entrance at the northwest corner of the Parliament Building. Those wishing to sign the book will enter from the west drive of the building, and members of the Ontario Provincial Police will be on duty to provide directions. The OPP will also provide a guard of honour in the

lobby. The book will be displayed from 9 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock each weekday afternoon from now until Monday, June 5, the day of the funeral, and then will be forwarded to Her Majesty.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members of the House to rise and join with me, in paying our last respects to His Royal Highness the Duke of Windsor—a much-loved prince and king—by observing just a moment's silence.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

UNAVAILABILITY OF WOMEN JURORS

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney General if he will comment on the decision taken by Judge Ray Stortini when he adjourned a trial because he felt that not enough women were available for jury duty.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Courageous and perceptive!

Hon. D. H. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have just read the account of the trial that took place, or at least the proceedings that took place yesterday. As I understand it, a number of ladies were called, the exact number I am not sure, for jury duty, but there was none on that particular panel. Under the provisions of section 4 of the Jurors Act, they are entitled to request that they be relieved of their responsibility as jurors.

The hon. member may be aware that the federal government has presently a bill before it, Bill C-2, which does make certain changes in reference to that. I would advise the hon. member that I am contemplating further changes in reference to the Jurors Act during this session of the Legislature.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Then what amounts to an automatic exemption of women from jury duty is a responsibility of this House and it could be amended or changed here?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The present section 4 can be amended. The federal Act is in force in reference to criminal situations; but that bill is presently before the House of Commons for change. Actually, it's in the Senate at the moment.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney General advise us as to what interpretation he puts on remarks in the same story, to the effect that the county sheriff angrily assailed the judge's action as "completely illegal" and vowed, "There is going to be more heard about this?"

Hon. Mr. Bales: I have noted those remarks. I think they were quite inappropriate, nevertheless.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, would the Attorney General undertake to discuss this matter with the sheriff in question and determine what the sheriff thinks are his duties and his rights and whether or not he feels he is in a position to tell judges what to do?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The law offices of the ministry will certainly be in touch with him.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Let it be noted that the good judge is a northerner.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And a former student of the Leader of the Opposition, which makes one feel a little old.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): I didn't know we had any teenage judges.

LITTER REGULATIONS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Will he tell the House if it is a fact that three draft copies of regulations have been rejected by cabinet dealing with the matter of litter; and whether or not, in fact, we can have approval of reasonable regulations to coincide with the $150,000 advertising programme announced by his colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld)?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is well aware that it would be quite improper to discuss what has been before cabinet and what hasn't in terms of content or numbers. The matter of regulations, as it relates to environmental control in this province, will be announced as a matter of government policy. Really, it would not be appropriate to indicate cabinet discussion or what was proposed to cabinet.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: I wonder if it would be appropriate for the Premier to explain why there has been, what I would consider an unconscionable delay in regulations under The Environmental Protection Act, which is now almost a year old.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of Course, Mr. Speaker, there are already existing regulations.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not already!

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are proposed further regulations, which the department, the minister and the government want to assess very carefully. It is a very important issue for the people of this province, and it is receiving very careful consideration.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier not consider it inconsistent that the government or the ministry wasn't prepared to go forward with regulations in support of this rather elaborate advertising campaign with all of those attractive jingles we hear on the radio?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I don't think so at all, Mr. Speaker, because there are several aspects to any form of environmental control, including that of litter. Part of it can be done by way of regulation, but part of it is a question of public education. There is no question about that.

There are laws now governing some aspects of litter, which laws are not always easy to enforce, as I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is fully aware. As a result, the question of public education, I think, is quite relevant; and it is not inconsistent to have that campaign going on at the same time as other approaches are being developed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Who, in fact, is stopping the implementation of the pledge given by the former minister that the government would bring forward regulations banning unreturnable bottles?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, no one is stopping anything that makes sense and that is relevant.

Mr. Singer: Starting—that's the question!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a question of doing it in a way that is most appropriate and very carefully thought out.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But the government is going to do it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are going to do something.

Mr. Singer: Something! Why regulate when you can jingle?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Some day!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): May I ask, by way of supplementary, will all the regulations appear simultaneously? There are the noise regulations, the waste management regulations and the litter regulations. Can we have a timetabling of them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to give any timetabling, nor can I assure the leader of the New Democratic Party they will all necessarily appear at the same time.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT OF YORK UNIVERSITY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Has he given any further instructions to the administration in his ministry, so that the attitude expressed by the president of York University will be, let us say, ameliorated? Would he agree that half-thought-out, last-minute harassment on the part of his department has, and I quote the president, "diverted us into confusion and crisis management?"

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the pronouncements, shall we say, of the president of York University. There has been a number of comments made during the past week or so, because there has been a number of convocations in Ontario during the past week or so. It seems that many of the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the minister getting honorary degrees, so that he can add to them?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, no honorary degrees; just the honorary diplomas at this stage.

As I say, there have been a number of comments from the various campuses emanating from year-end reports by presidents, and of course they have taken issue with some of the things that have happened at Queen's Park. This is something that the Committee on University Affairs and my ministry, including the Council of Ontario Universities, are working on at the present time.

We are attempting to arrive at a BIU formula for the next fiscal year. At the same time, we are considering all of those aggravating things that the presidents have been talking about. So I hope that even with the

fee increases, particularly in respect to graduate students, this will be ironed out before we adjourn this session.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: The minister is not then saying that the statement was in any way exaggerated, is he? Secondly, in his efforts to improve the situation, would he agree that before any changes are arrived at in the financial status of the universities, through tuition or in any other respect, that the department, and perhaps, even the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), would consult with those people in the post-secondary field who would have to live with these decisions?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I didn't indicate that I thought the president's statement was exaggerated, nor did I say that it was valid. As far as the Treasurer is concerned, I have some reservations about involving the Treasury in any discussions with the Committee on University Affairs or my ministry, but I think possibly we will consult with him sometime between now and the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. Stokes: Don't be too hopeful.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He's a very busy man.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I might say, though, that the changes the hon. member refers to are being discussed. The whole question of enrolment as a result of these changes is something we are really concerned with at the present time, and of course will have to wait with the passing of time. But I am hoping that this will not be aggravated in any way, and that the predictions we have now for enrolment in our institutions will not substantially change in September or October. I feel, really, that the universities will not be badly off, that some of the statements—I don't know about the president of York—but some of the statements will prove to have been exaggerated.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If you'll permit one further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the minister say in connection with the Treasury that the initiative for the $100 average tuition increase came from his department, the Treasury department or some emanation of that department, since the minister is concerned about involving the Treasurer in these decisions.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, happily I was not involved at that stage in the discussions regarding any increase in tuition fees.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Was the minister aware of it?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That is when the minister thought he was going to stay out of it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Frankly I would like to blame them on the hon. member for Chatham, but I don't think he is responsible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is an eminently blameable person.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He's a very convincing man. But seriously, I think this was part of an overall picture in dealing with the estimates and expenditures of this government, and I think the decision was by the government.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

STATUS OF WOMEN IN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question first of the Minister of Colleges and Universities, Mr. Speaker?

More than a month later, has the minister yet decided whether or not to appoint the committee requested of him by the status of women committee in Ontario; that is, a committee to look at all the apparent inequalities and discriminatory features of post-secondary education.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: This is being considered at the present time, Mr. Speaker. One of the suggestions made during my discussion with the committee dealing with the status of women was the possibility of a select committee.

Mr. Lewis: Of what? A select committee?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, a select committee of the Legislature. This is one type of committee that might be able to consider the problems of the status of women in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: I'll tell you what: You just enact legislation and we will forgo the select committees.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well there are certain ramifications that still have to be studied as

far as women in Ontario are concerned; and the question there is of equality in all circumstances. So this is still something that's ongoing. We hope to have a decision for that committee by July.

Mr. Reid: Can I be on that select commitee?

Mr. Speaker: The question is out of order.

An hon. member: We need his point of view.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I'd like to pursue that: Is the minister saying that he is recommending to the Premier and his cabinet colleagues that such a select committee be struck, presumably this session?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am just saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the considerations of the type of committee or forum that may be used to study this matter.

Mr. Lewis: Would he consider responding as willingly to the specific recommendations and requests which the status of women committee suggested to him as he is to establishing yet another committee to go over the ground which has now been gone over for several years?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's information seems to be either lacking or incorrect. The committee that I met with requested that some committee be set up by the government, involving their representation as well as representation from universities, representation from the government and citizen representation.

During these discussions, the question of a select committee, as being the type of vehicle that would satisfy them, was discussed and they weren't quite as happy with that idea because they felt, first of all, it might take too long; and secondly, members from their group would not be on the committee.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. It would have a certain bias.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Right! I explained to them, however, that their group could make submissions to a select committee and that I was sure that with the makeup of a select committee they would be satisfied with the type of responsiveness they would get.

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Labour: Has the Minister of Labour responded to the request of the status of women committee in Ontario to establish an ongoing group associated with the human rights committee to explore the many direct complaints of discrimination in post-secondary education?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, we are vitally concerned in this field, through our women's bureau of course. We are presently bringing some suggestions of our own from our ministry to the policy field committee. So far we are primarily engaged in the supervision of employment, through our employment standards branch, seeing that women do get equality with males as far as jobs and salaries are concerned. But to specifically answer his question, we are presenting a study ourselves to the resources field committee shortly.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the minister has not yet amended the Human Rights Code to include sex as a category on the basis of which discrimination is disallowed?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West is quite right. We have been working on it for several months, I would think, or many weeks. Only it is not as easy as perhaps my hon. friend might think. We have had several problems. However, we are just about ready to come forward with legislation to include sex and marital status under the Ontario Human Rights Code.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Has the minister been informed of the case of Walper House Hofbrau in Kitchener which denied the right of entry to a group of women seeking to be seated at lunch? Would he be interested in investigating that under the amendments he's bringing in?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes we would be glad to look at every angle; but I can only repeat, there are areas where it is very difficult and that's the reason for the delay. But I will look into this case as well.

Mr. Lewis: I know all the double entendre that emerges in a discussion like this, but I want now to ask the Solicitor General designate—is he still designate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. Where has the member been?

An hon. member: He has made it.

Mr. Lewis: Sorry; he is through.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): April 10 I took the oath.

Mr. Lewis: Good. May I ask the Solicitor General—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not the pledge! Not the pledge!

Mr. Lewis: Would that he had.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why should he more than others?

LCBO JOBS FOR WOMEN

Mr. Lewis: What is the policy of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario in the hiring of women employees in the Liquor Control Board stores?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: So far as I am concerned and understand, there is no differentiation at all; all of the employment opportunities are available to them, subject of course to certain exigencies—

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —such as tossing around cases of whisky and beer in warehouses, which does not really lend itself to sort of a wide-open opportunity for women.

Mr. MacDonald: Has he ever been down to Loblaw's and watched the women work there?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): It is not the sexiest job!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On the other hand, tapping a cash register in a self-service store lends itself admirably to the skills available; so that subject to what I hope will be a common sense approach, the field of opportunity is wide open. As a matter of fact, every day it becomes even more open.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That's because the women are becoming stronger.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not too long ago we introduced the first barmaids into the whole industry. One of the beer firms has now hired women as part of its promotional staff, which was exclusively a men's reserve.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, they have hired a woman for public relations? That is quite a breakthrough.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, not in public relations, in the general activities.

Mr. Lewis: Just out of curiosity, can the minister tell me where in the Toronto vicinity there is a considerable number of women employees in the Liquor Control Board outlets equal, I presume, in number to men?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I would—

Mr. Lewis: I know that the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) has found a few in Scarborough. I am asking you for—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I would hate to have to demonstrate to the hon. member that I am more familiar with liquor stores than he is, but my recollection is that I drove by a self-service—

Mr. Renwick: Keep your eyes on the road!

Mr. Lewis: On that kind of familiarity, born of voyeurism, the minister is more familiar than I am!

Mr. Renwick: He drove by and he noticed!

Mr. MacDonald: No wonder the accident rate is going up!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I think the store is on Yonge St.—I would be very pleased to obtain information—and the only time I ever knocked on this door it was locked.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister aware that stores in northern Ontario have already made that progressive step forward and they are in fact hiring women?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Oh yes, this is right across the province. When we take a progressive step it is right across the province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: It's a giant step!

ONTARIO CLUB MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Lewis: One last question of the Premier, if I may, Mr. Speaker. When the Premier opened the new Ontario Club on May 9, was he aware that membership is barred to women?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I knew nothing about any regulations of that particular organization. I was very kindly invited to officiate at the opening, which I did.

Mr. MacDonald: How about the Carlton Club?

Mr. Lewis: Did the Premier notice a certain absence?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of women? As a matter of fact, when I was there—

Mr. Lewis: Is the Premier familiar in the way his Solicitor General is?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have to confess I think it was the first time, certainly in the new premises. I would have to make this observation, that there was a large number of women present at the opening, probably there as guests of their husbands or friends.

Mr. Lewis: Husbands are allowed to bring them as guests?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Whether they were necessarily members I wouldn't know, but there were several women in evidence at the opening.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): At least two, eh?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, as a matter of fact, in reply to that supplementary question of the member for Ottawa Centre, I would say there were about 40 or 50. I know he likes to be accurate, so it would be slightly in excess of two.

Mr. Renwick: By way of a supplementary question, is the Premier aware of the long-standing tradition of the connection of the Ontario Club with the Liberal Party?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it was very evident on Oct. 21 that certain long-standing traditions went by the board as it relates to both the official opposition and the unofficial opposition. And I sensed, when I attended the opening of the Ontario Club, that tradition was not, perhaps, as prevalent as it was some years ago. In fact, I sensed there a very large number of friends and supporters of this present administration, which of course is true right across this province. Thank heavens that's the case.

Mr. Lewis: There's the Ontario Club to answer the Premier; and they have not brought their wives as guests.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't see any of them there.

An hon. member: They can't afford to be members.

Mr. Speaker: If there are no supplementaries, does the hon. leader—all right, the hon. Minister of Industry and Tourism has the answer to a question previously asked.

STUDY OF PERFORMANCE LOAN PROGRAMME

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, on Friday the leader of the NDP asked a question which I would now like to answer.

I wish to reply to a question from the hon. member for Scarborough West requesting information concerning performance loans now under consideration by the Ontario Development Corp. and the Northern Ontario Development Corp. A review of applications under consideration shows that there are about 30 from foreign-owned companies and that these loans would involve approximately $3.3 million. Performance loan applications for Canadian-owned companies number about 83, with the total dollar value of just over $7 million.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has the answer to a question.

WEEKEND PARKING FOR PUBLIC AT DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR LOTS

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) asked me yesterday concerning the possibility of the parking lots of the Workmen's Compensation Board being open to the public on weekends. I have been informed that these parking lots have been opened to the public on weekends and holidays for some years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Tell them that the member for St. Andrew arranged that.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The board and the Toronto Harbour Commission have an agreement whereby the Harbour Commission operates the lots on weekends and holidays on behalf of itself and the board. After expenses of this operation are deducted, the profits are shared between the board and the commission. For some time it has been the practice to turn the profits over to the Workmen's Compensation Board staff association, which in turn donates it to a charity.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, a question of either the Treasurer or the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Well, the hon. member should make his mind up.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): He doesn't know who can handle it.

REQUEST FOR MEETING WITH TREASURER

Mr. Sargent: That is right. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in the past nine years no minister has refused to grant an interview to my constituents, to the reeve or wardens; in view of the fact five weeks ago I wrote the provincial Treasurer and asked him for a meeting with five reeves who had requested it—in a very nice way I asked him for a meeting—he avoided me.

An hon. member: He always does.

Mr. Sargent: He has not had the courtesy to answer my letter. Last week I asked him why I wouldn't get the courtesy of a reply. He said that he had written me a letter—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member—

Mr. Sargent: This is very important, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please direct his question?

Mr. Sargent: I am asking the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, why don't I rate the courtesy of a reply? Why he said he wrote me a letter I did not receive? Why, with this multi-million dollar development these people are concerned about, they cannot get an audience with him? Why don't I, as a member, have the right and the courtesy to an answer to my request?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the letter referred to by the hon. member was dated May 3, as I recall. I replied to it on May 18. If it is lost somewhere in the Liberal offices or in the member's office, I'm afraid I can't be responsible for what happens to the mail once it leaves my office. I indicated in that letter—

Mr. Sargent: Will the Treasurer send me a copy of that letter?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, we'll send the member a copy of the letter.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): He doesn't come in often enough to pick up his mail!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't know that I can add anything to that comment! I indicated in the letter of May 18 that a task force had been established by the Ontario government. I had requested and I felt it was appropriate that that task force, which consists of members of my own department or the Department of the Environment or the Department of Natural Resources, should have a meeting with the four reeves of the four municipalities in question prior to my meeting with them, to see if some of the problems could not be sorted out or delineated at the staff level. It is my understanding that such a meeting is being arranged for, I think, Thursday of this week.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: The reason they won't buy this; they want to meet with the Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker: What's the question?

Mr. Sargent: The question is: Why the minister can not, in view of the fact that he meets with other municipalities, meet with my people?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Does the hon. member really want to know? No, maybe I had better not. The member—

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I would like to know! Yes! This is the basic thing we are here for, Mr. Speaker. It is, in fact, why we can't get fair treatment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will be seated. The hon. minister will reply.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think it is a little bit unreasonable to suggest municipalities—I don't know how many municipalities and conservation authorities are in the whole escarpment area—this is exactly the purpose of the task force; to find out what the problems are, to—

Mr. Sargent: We are not buying it at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We're not even selling it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well then, if the member isn't interested in the answer; then those people up there and I know the hon. member is trying to use them for some nefarious political purpose; which doesn't wash well.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: This bellowing bulk of ineptitude here, has the audacity to say that I would use my

people like that; now that is not true. We are talking about a million-dollar-development and this man makes a joke of it.

Mr. Speaker, I will stand here all day until this man agrees to meet with my people, because I have been kicked out on smaller deals than this one.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Perhaps the hon. member will be seated.

Mr. Sargent: I will sit down when I find that he will meet—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will be seated.

Mr. Sargent: Okay! I will be right back up again.

Mr. Speaker: I should like to suggest to the hon. minister that perhaps his remarks were a little strong in that he referred to the member as using these people in a "nefarious" manner. I would suggest to him that this remark should not really have been made.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. Sargent: All right; the minister must tell me the day that he will meet with my people; or I will stand here all day, or be kicked out.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have any further comments?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, rather than see the Leader of the Opposition further embarrassed, I would be delighted to meet with those people.

Mr. Sargent: The minister is going to meet the people on Friday?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't want to see the member's leader further embarrassed this afternoon.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the minister very much. He will meet with the people.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. minister said he would.

The hon. member for Wentworth.

HAMILTON HARBOUR LANDFILL

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the minister able to inform the House on the status of the negotiation or discussions between the Province of Ontario and the federal government with regard to the jurisdiction over Hamilton harbour?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I regret I cannot give any positive indication at this point in time. I might say that negotiations are still progressing and we are now discussing this further with the local conservation authorities. Beyond that, I wouldn't care to comment at this time.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Are there members of the Hamilton city council involved on the team that is doing the negotiation?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In these negotiations with the federal government? No, there are no members of city council; but we have been in discussion with them and they are aware of our moves.

Mr. Deans: A final supplementary question: Could I ask the minister if he would consider involving a member or two of the Hamilton city council in the negotiations directly, in order that they might understand exactly what is going on and play a more important role in the final disposition of this very difficult problem?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I believe I informed the mayor of that fair city that we would keep him informed of the various steps that we are taking, and he will be constantly kept informed of any actions and deliberations that we take.

KENORA-RAINY RIVER TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications has the answer to a previous question.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question posed by the member for Rainy River; it concerns the Kenora-Rainy River study. It is presently being reviewed by several of the ministries in this government, and then a transportation system will be recommended. We are hoping that this will reach the ministerial level in September of this year; and then it will be presented to certain government agencies for their findings. I am hoping to have it ready for the local members involved, including the hon. member, towards the end of 1972. Then there will be interested local groups that will be asked to participate. After that, I see no reason why it cannot be made public.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Stokes: Can I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, yes.

Mr. Stokes: How does the minister think he is going to develop a transportation programme on such a limited basis? Should it not be on a regional basis rather than just on a district basis, such as Kenora-Rainy River? Why doesn't he involve all of Northwestern Ontario, as his predecessor attempted to do?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, there are several studies going on at the same time as this one is going on. I'm sure that they will be all put in together into the same package.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

PURCHASE OF COACHES FOR GO TRANSIT

Mr. D. M. Deacon: (York Centre): I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

In view of the serious congestion which now prevails on certain rush-hour trains and which will increase if the service is properly run and traffic increases, will the minister not change the order for the additional passenger coaches to double-decker coaches and switch the existing Lakeshore coaches now in use to meet the needs of the Brampton run?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I missed the last part of the question, Mr. Speaker, but—

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I will just add, then, switch some of the existing Lakeshore cars to the Brampton run to meet the needs of that run. In other words, any new cars should be double-deckers to improve the service on the Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, knowing the hon. member's concern with double-deckers, and anticipating this question I had done some investigation into double-decker cars. I am informed—and of course I'm not an expert, but I rely on experts—that, having regard to the operating costs and having regard to the operational facilities and other matters, we are better to go along with the single-decker cars presently.

The double-decker cars cost 250 per cent more and increase the capacity by only 75 per cent. It will take two years in order to get the double-decker cars, I'm informed. So, having regard to these—but notwithstanding this there is continuing investigation into the use of double-decker cars.

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary: In view of the fact that Canadian Pacific Railway, which is not a charity-motivated corporation, invested in double-decker cars to meet the requirements of its Montreal service and found them to be more profitable and that they provided better service, would the minister not investigate more closely the figures that have been given to him by his experts?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but bear in mind there would be a difference between the type of rolling stock that we would use on GO transit than there would be on the conventional facilities, even for the Montreal-Toronto run; but I will investigate.

Mr. Deacon: I am talking about the Montreal commuter service.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The Montreal commuter service?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex South.

EGG INDUSTRY

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

In view of the critical conditions that have developed on top of the already serious condition in the egg industry in Ontario due to subsidized eggs being brought into this province, does the minister have any intentions to take some immediate steps to alleviate the problem?

An hon. member: That is a planted question.

Mr. MacDonald: He dreamed that up when—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): In reply to the remark from my friend from Essex-Kent, it's not a planted question. The first I heard of it was when he asked me just now. Now let's make that clear.

Mr. Reid: Well, answer it.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is the minister going to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Sure I'm going to answer it. The member for Essex-Kent wanted

to stand up and make a statement; let him stand up and make a statement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): That's not egg on the member's face either.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: Would you control him please?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, just because the private members of the great government caucus of this House are interested enough to ask a question the head of that group over there takes exception to it. It is a very intelligent question, too.

Mr. Reid: Well answer!

Mr. MacDonald: It is the first one this year that wasn't planted. That is why the minister is so surprised.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, come on; lay another one. Let him hatch it while it is still warm.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): What is the loose egg price?

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the minister going to stand there until we arrange a meeting?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Don't be so thin shelled.

Mr. Martel: What is he offering there?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member has asked a very intelligent and a very strong question. I have been meeting all morning with the egg board here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The meeting is still going on, as far as I know.

Mr. Lewis: It is fortunate it was not planted then.

Mr. Stokes: I hope it was not the old shell game.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It was laid.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The meeting is still going on. As far as I know, there will be a satisfactory resolution of the problem.

Mr. Singer: A very strong answer to a very strong question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Hopefully, today; I can assure the members that it's well in hand.

Mr. Lewis: Well, one in the hand!

Mr. MacDonald: Talk about laying verbal eggs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Flip a coin, fellows!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, a question—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park had been attempting to get the floor long before the hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, here is another plant!

CANCELLATION OF CAR SALESMAN'S REGISTRATION

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister intervene in the case of one—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I would like to plant one on the member for Scarborough West any day!

Mr. Shulman: —Thomas Lariviere who will be forced to go to jail for three years as a result of the action of the commercial registration appeal tribunal, which revoked his registration as a car salesman which will automatically revoke his probation and send him back to jail?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): I know nothing of the situation referred to by the hon. member, but I will have a look at it when I return to my office this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

WATER SUPPLIES TO CITIES FROM RURAL AREAS

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Again?

Mr. Good: —in view of the fact that the water branch of the Department of the Environment is drawing up regulations as they relate to permits for the pumping of water by the cities from rural areas—these regulations have to do with off-stream farm ponds—is the minister aware of these regulations? What input has the Department of Agriculture had in the drawing of the regulations which will affect farm ponds in city areas?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to have knowledge about a situation which I have not, at the moment, in detail. I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Good: The minister means he doesn't want to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

COMMENTS BY PRESIDENT OF CANADIAN DRIVER POOL

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I have a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister agree with the statements by Richard Grange, president of Canadian Driver Pool, in an address to the St. Lawrence Valley Personnel Association early in the month when he said:

> Canadian Driver Pool services are designated primarily to assist in preventing strikes and in the time of a legal strike, it's management's legal right to hire temporary help and to keep the plant in full production.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I certainly wasn't aware of the speech or remarks made by Mr. Grange. I shall be glad to read what he has said in the first place.

As the hon. member knows, we already have an investigation going into his operations. At this time, I cannot tell the results.

Mr. MacDonald: It certainly doesn't deter him.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, maybe not so for now. I don't have any answer at the moment, but we are looking at it—as a matter of fact, several departments are.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S CONTRIBUTION TO CNE

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

I wonder if I may say, before I put the question, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side are very happy that the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations were not in the aircraft that had the accident yesterday.

To the Minister of Agriculture: How much does his department contribute to the operation of the Canadian National Exhibition? How much does he provide in the way of grants or prize money? How much comes from his department to that organization?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker. I haven't those figures at my immediate disposal.

Mr. Reid: There is some?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I really don't know what they are. I can get the figures for the member. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

ACTION CANADA LEADER'S COMMENTS ON SUBVERSION

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): I have a question of the Solicitor General.

Mr. Lewis: It wouldn't matter if he planted it or not.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Yakabuski: Would the Solicitor General care to tell this House what he or his people know about the very serious charges that Mr. Paul Hellyer, leader of the Action Canada party, levied in recent days with regard to subversive activities?

Mr. MacDonald: The Tories are playing ball with themselves now.

Mr. Shulman: The Solicitor General hasn't even been able to find the Mafia. How is he going to find that?

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): That was yesterday's amendment.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the matter touched upon by Mr. Hellyer, in respect of which the hon. member has asked a question, comes completely within the federal

jurisdiction, although I do know that our forces lend their good offices and co-operate, I believe, in the ordinary way that police forces would. This is purely a federal matter.

Mr. Yakabuski: May I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Certainly.

Mr. Yakabuski: Do the charges levied by Mr. Hellyer disturb the minister in any way?

Mr. Lewis: Is the member kidding?

Mr. Deans: The minister is always disturbed.

Mr. Foulds: He is already disturbed.

Mr. Lewis: He sees one under every bed.

Mr. Martel: That is Allan.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the broad topic of the infiltration or the activities of the Communist Party and Communist supporters in the province and in the nation have always been of very grave concern to me.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the minister is concerned, has he any evidence whatsoever that this sort of infiltration has taken place? Surely he can't be concerned based on his original answer.

Mr. Lewis: Doesn't he have a list of 346 names that he is prepared to produce?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: About 21.

An hon. member: That is what has happened.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I do not regard this particular topic with the extreme levity of the leader of the NDP—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister doesn't regard anything with levity!

Mr. Lewis: I regard the minister and Hellyer with levity.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I say to the Leader of the Opposition, I have never closed my eyes—

Mr. Renwick: Even when you are driving down Yonge St.?

Mr. Reid: Try it, you will like it!

Mr. Lewis: Look who is coming up behind you, John.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have never closed my eyes, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: No, the minister is always looking into Liquor Control Board offices.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —to the possibility of a recurrence of what has happened in the past.

Mr. Sargent: Where is the minister playing tomorrow night?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not so naïve as to believe—

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, he is.

Mr. Reid: Stop right there!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —as the leader of the NDP has, in the course of his own life, that Communism, the threat of Communism, the goal of Communism, as stated in the past 50 years, right from Karl Marx to Lenin to the present, is a dead issue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I regard this appearing in a newspaper of—

Mr. Foulds: The minister has it upside down.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It's right side up. The member is standing on his head.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Comedy hour!

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. MacDonald: So has the minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what is that the minister is carrying around in his hand clutched to his bosom? Is that the Marcuse article?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes; as a matter of fact, it is very interesting.

Mr. Lewis: In the Toronto Star? We all know about that paper.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mrs. Birch from the standing social development committee reported the following resolution:

RESOLVED: That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973.

Ministry of Colleges and Universities: Ministry administration programme, $2,407,000; post-secondary education support programme, $687,298,000; cultural and general education support programme, $28,616,000; archives and records management programme, $912,000; advisory committees programme, $364,000.

Mr. Bullbrook: It's not much when you say it fast.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the order for third reading of Bill 116, An Act to amend the Ontario Development Corp. Act, be rescinded and the bill be referred to the committee of the whole House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I presume that the ministry wants to amend that bill and that is why they are putting it back into committee?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is my understanding.

Mr. Lewis: That was our understanding.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is that the Ontario Development Corp. Act or the Northern Ontario Development Corp. Act, Bill 115?

Mr. Speaker: It says the Ontario Development Corp. Act, Bill 116. It should be the Northern Ontario Development Corp. Act.

Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Reid: On a point of order, is the minister going to amend both bills or just the one bill?

Mr. Singer: Or does he know?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I read the motion as it was given to me.

Mr. Lewis: The other one is in committee, so it isn't necessary in its regard.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Thank you for your assistance.

Mr. Shulman: Can the Speaker inform me, is it possible to rescind a third reading on a motion?

Mr. Speaker: It hasn't been read a third time; it is only on the order paper.

Mr. Renwick: It's on the first page, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The order appears on the order paper as item 1, which calls for third reading of Bill 116, An Act to amend the Northern Ontario Development Corp. Act. The motion presented to the House at this time, moved by Mr. Winkler, is that the order for third reading of Bill 116, An Act to amend the Northern Ontario Development Corp. Act, be rescinded and the bill be referred to the committee of the whole House.

In other words, it is on the order paper only for third reading, it has not received third reading; and rather than go from second reading to third reading is to go to committee of the whole House. That, I believe, is the intention of the motion.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Then it's agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, this bill corrects references to sections of the Income Tax Act Canada with no change in substance and provides for the property tax credit available to Ontario taxpayers as outlined in the budget speech.

SECURITIES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Securities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to encompass the idea of timely disclosure by corporations in law rather than leaving it to their discretion.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The fourth order, committee of the whole House; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR CROWN EMPLOYEES

(concluded)

House in committee on Bill 105, An Act to provide for Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees.

Mr. Chairman: We had finished section 17. Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to a later section? If so, which section?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Section 25.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before 25? Everything carried up to 25? The member for Wentworth.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: All right, one moment please.

Mr. Gisborn: Did you say 24 or 25?

Mr. Chairman: The member said 25.

Mr. Gisborn: I have something on 24.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Anything before 24? The member for Hamilton East on section 24.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, Mr. Chairman, this section 24, under "Prohibitions," reads:

> No person shall attempt at the employee's place of employment to persuade him to become or refrain from becoming a member of an employee organization.

Certainly this follows the whole discredit of this Act in being a cheap and very undesirable piece of legislation in this particular bill. If anything should be left in collective bargaining, it should be this portion. These kinds of clauses went out of date some 15 years ago and if anything belittles the trust in an organization it is this kind of thing.

What has taken place in most agreements in the past, in the enlightenment of today's trust, is that when a collective bargaining agreement is signed, you agree that something takes place in regard to your union security clause, and most of them allow that when a new employee is hired he is given a copy of the agreement. He is given a pamphlet explaining the organization that represents the majority of employees in the group and in most cases an introduction to the steward of the branch that he is employed in.

The fact that they cannot, under this, have any access to persuading or enticing or encouraging an employee to be a member of the organization while on the job is just absolute parental dictatorship. I never thought that I would see that kind of a clause in a bill that first sets out what is allowed under collective bargaining. Surely the government doesn't really mean this should he in here?

Wouldn't the minister agree that that could be negotiated, the type of liaison, the type of communication between the organization and a new employee would be left to the people to decide in the collective agreement, along with the up-to-date sections that are contained in most agreements today? Years ago, when you fought tooth and nail to get a majority to become certified and these kinds of clauses were an insistence of management, you had to go behind the pillars or in the washrooms secretly to talk to an employee to get him to join the organization. Those days are past.

One can't condemn this section enough. It shows the pettiness, the cheapness of the people who have drafted this bill to install that kind of a section in there. And one has to realize just what kind of thinking goes into this kind of communication. I would hope the minister will delete this section and at least leave that to the negotiating of an agreement.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Branch): I don't think the Chairman will consider that proposition. Section 24 is taken straight from the Labour Relations Act. It has already been passed by this Legislature.

Mr. Deans: That doesn't alter the theory.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it does make a very great difference.

Mr. Gisborn: But Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it is not the Ontario Labour Relations Act that that is involved. I have read the Labour Relations Act and I would have to say that the minister is incorrect. Does he suggest that section is taken from the Ontario Labour Relations Act? I wish he'd quote it and present it for me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes I will. I'll do that. I don't have the Act with me, but I'll get it and quote it.

Mr. Deans: Even if it were in the Labour Relations Act, what difference does it make?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It makes a very great deal of difference.

Mr. Deans: Couldn't it be wrong there, too?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I'm not about to accept the fact that a statute passed by the Legislature of this province — the Labour Relations Act—is too far wrong. I'm not about to accept that.

I quote section 62 on page 33 of the Labour Relations Act:

> Nothing in this Act authorizes any person to attend at the place in which an employee works to persuade him during his work hours to become or refrain from becoming or continuing to be a member of a trade union.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, it says that but it doesn't provide that it outlaws it. It allows for collective agreement to provide for a method of communication and under a union securities boss.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 24 stand as part of the bill?

Carried.

The member for Wentworth on section 25.

Mr. Deans: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that we find section 25 extremely difficult to accept. It is wrong to deny—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In your opinion.

Mr. Deans: In my opinion. Well, let me get that cleared right off the bat. In case there's any doubt as to whose opinion I'm expressing at any time that I stand in this House—I want to get clear to everybody; I'm expressing my opinion!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Good! That's understood then.

Mr. Deans: Okay?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Fine! Great!

Mr. Deans: Now I don't have to have you interject every two minutes with that inane, ridiculous little statement; okay?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No you don't have to; but I reserve the right to do it, if I feel so inclined.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Don't provoke the minister.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): This is compulsory inanity.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, the hon. member should be well versed on that one. He should know!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: There is no justification in the history of labour relations between Crown employees and the Crown in the Province of Ontario, for this particular section to be included in this Act.

It is entirely possible that there are some areas of the public service which may be designated as being outside—as not having the right to strike; as being essential areas for employment. But I suggest to the minister that this is the laziest way out of resolving a very difficult problem. He has taken the easiest way, rather than trying to come to grips with what the problem really is.

Even in the Province of New Brunswick they were able to determine which of the employees were required under essential services categories, and they then set aside special provision to deal with that.

The Province of Ontario has said that every single person, regardless of the function they perform, shall not be entitled to withhold their services, regardless of the provocation; and I suggest right off the bat that, in my opinion, that is wrong. I suspect that that opinion may well be shared by two or three other people in this Legislature.

And I say to the minister that what should have been done in this case—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): He's got more backers than the minister has at this moment.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suspect it as well. I am looking at them.

Mr. Deans: —was that there should have been a discussion take place between the Management Board of cabinet, or whatever Crown agency negotiates for management, and the employees in an effort to resolve which are, in fact, essential services. The minister might then have brought forward a bill which spelled out the areas where the right to strike was to be inhibited and to deal then with those employees in a way which will compensate them for the loss of this right—a right which I believe is a civil right of every individual in this province, or for that matter, in this country.

I suggest to the minister that this particular clause was incorporated because he and his government are too lazy to sit down and try to work out a sensible proposal to deal with matters of essential services. I suggest to the minister that, in fact, what he has done here is deny to employees who have never abused the rights that they previously had, a right which is inherent in the civil liberties of the Province of Ontario.

I also suggest to the minister, as I have done to the trade union movement and will continue to do, that it is the thin edge of the wedge. It is the first move by this government toward establishing compulsory arbitration right across the board. I feel that it will react on the minister and his government at some point—maybe not during my tenure of office but at some point—in such a way as to provoke the employees into actions which at this time they do not contemplate.

What you have done is, on the one hand you have severely inhibited the matters which can be bargained for and, on the other hand, reduced the only way they have of expressing their dissatisfaction with working conditions. You will have eventually a clash between their frustrations at not being able to come to grips with what are legitimate complaints over working conditions and, on the other hand, their inability to take any kind of direct action to bring these matters to the government's attention. You will develop within the civil service a feeling of frustration and distrust which will inevitably boil over.

If you had been prepared to do as was done, as I say, in New Brunswick—I am not suggesting that they are a model but they at least offer some compromise—and sit down and set out the areas where you believed it was absolutely essential that service be maintained and then go to the employees and bargain on that basis, my guess is that the Civil Service Association, as I understand it, would have been prepared to sit down and to come to some satisfactory agreement on areas to be designated as essential services. But this was never done.

To say to me that some person who drives a limousine is providing an essential service and has no right to strike; or some person who works in a liquor store is providing an essential service and has no right to strike; or any member of other places in the civil service—a secretary working in this building has no right to strike—is just a lot of hogwash. There is no justification for saying that those services are essential any more than any others.

I say to you that we will simply vote against this section of the bill. I find it very unpalatable.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not surprised to hear that. I am not surprised at all to hear that.

Mr. Deans: I didn't think you would be surprised. I suspect I may have told you this before.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think likely you have.

Mr. Deans: I think, quite frankly, that this clause and clauses 17 and 6 have got to be the most repressive, regressive clauses in any legislation brought forward in the four-plus years that I have been in the Legislature.

I can think of no other legislation about which I have felt the kind of concern that I feel about this—not because of its content but because it is a reflection of the government's attitude toward the people of the Province of Ontario.

You know, I have a lot of faith in the people of the Province of Ontario; I have faith in their ability to do things right. I trust them. I think the majority of people in this province have just as much commitment to the province as you have. I think that they are prepared to act in a responsible and in a responsive manner and they have done so over the years.

It is not a wild dream of mine that they can do this—because if you look at labour relations in the Province of Ontario down through the years, between employers—the Crown whether it be the government directly or agencies—and their employees, the employees have without exception acted in a responsible manner. I say to you that to take this attitude now, when there is no provocation and no justification, is irresponsible on the part of this government. It is a clear indication of the lack of faith that this government has in its employees. I say to you that you should be ashamed.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I rise to oppose this section too, Mr. Chairman. I dare say I probably do speak for the caucus in my opposition to this section. In Ontario 96.5 per cent of all contracts are settled

without resort to strikes—96.5 per cent. Many of these settlements are brought about by taking a strike vote, nonetheless, which causes the bargaining to take place in a heightened atmosphere and birngs the dispute to a head and the bargaining to conclusion. This is the type of thing which helps to settle the dispute one way or another. With no pressures to back up the demands of either side, you find that strikes tend to linger on.

I don't know why the government then takes the view that the civil service of Ontario is going to be less responsible than the rest of the people in Ontario about going this particular route in the final analysis. They are not now disallowed from striking, and yet they have not resorted to it, even in the circumstances of this bill where they are being denied the right to strike by unbelievably restrictive clauses with respect to their bargaining. Even though they are not disallowed now from striking, they have not resorted to the strike as a means of backing up their particular point of view.

Now that they have shown responsibility and restraint throughout, I do not see why the government should so assume that if they were allowed the right to strike that they would take advantage of this, particularly as this bill has already exempted all the essential services in the Province of Ontario. Hydro workers are exempted, hospital workers, the provincial police and so on, all areas of the public service that the general public might be concerned about if there was a strike and, particularly, a prolonged strike in these areas.

We are left with, what I would call, virtually the non-essential area of the public service. Why they should be denied this as their right is hard for me to understand, particularly when it is replaced by the particular system.

You have to look at what they are getting as a result of not having the right to strike. First, they can go to mediation. If the tribunal, again appointed by the employer, should decide that mediation is not working, he can cause it to go to arbitration.

What happens in arbitration? You do not have what appears in the Labour Relations Act, one person appointed by each party who then agree upon a chairman, but a chairman, again, appointed by the employer. The employer with two out of the three on that particular board has the majority say in what sort of settlement is to be arrived at. Again, at any time and in various areas, the tribunal, which can be a one-person tribunal, can step in and have its say at various points on the dispute.

This sort of procedure, where all the way down the line, the employer has the absolutely final say through the appointment of the tribunal, is not really collective bargaining. It is not even a very good type of arbitration. If you wanted to describe that type of arbitration, probably a phrase that would cover it would be "advisory arbitration," where they are advised all along by government, which has the final hand as to the type of contract they are going to receive.

I found the latest issue of the CSAO newspaper rather interesting. It referred to a government periodical which ran an article on staff relations and quoted some of the pronouncements which management made in that government periodical. The management said at one point: "In hopes of streamlining its procedures, the branch has set two major goals: earlier settlement and improved communications." CSAO replies to that:

> As for earlier settlements in 1972, may we advise management that its first step in that direction is to change its entire attitude toward collective bargaining. And while you are at it, management, you had better add the indispensable element, a sincere intent to bargain.

So here we have the CSAO saying to management that you have not indicated a sincere intent to bargain, and yet this bill presumably comes forward with management having the upper hand under the assumption that management is going to be a good management and is going to bargain throughout in good faith and take it seriously.

Management goes on to say in this periodical: "We hope that, beginning with the next cycle of bargaining, we can start to move quickly and move along much more quickly and earlier."

The comment was: "In case you didn't notice, management, negotiation in several areas is required right now and we are still waiting for you to start bargaining."

Again a quote by management in this government periodical: "I believe that negotiations in the Ontario public service are fast achieving a level of sophistication comparable with private industry."

And again, as a result of the bargaining or lack of it, CSAO comments: "We believe negotiations in the Ontario public service are fast achieving a level of hopeless procrastination by management."

This is the way the management, up until this date, has seemed to be conducting itself in its negotiations and its bargaining with the CSAO.

I don't see how this bill would change anything at this point when there are so many areas in clauses 6 and 17 that have to be ironed out even before you start. There are such things as where rights begin and end; then we go to the mediator, who can be replaced by the tribunal; then to the arbitration board, of which two out of the three are government appointees, in order to arrive at a collective bargaining position which can be imposed. The employees of Ontario and the Crown employees are put in a hopeless "Uncle Tom" situation by a government with an excessively paternalistic attitude in this case.

I can see in this situation only one way in which the Crown employees of Ontario could break the cycle of this whole situation in the bill; that is, to be allowed the right to strike. With all of the essential services exempted from this bill, I can see no reason why they are not given the right to strike and, Mr. Chairman, we will certainly vote against this section of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Any comments on section 25? Ready for the question then.

Those in favour of including section 25 as part of the bill will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

May we stack this vote with any succeding vote that there might be?

Mr. Deans: Just hold on a moment. I don't believe I have any others that I intend to divide on, so I think we might as well divide on this one now.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Ready for the question? The question is, shall section 25 stand as part of the bills?

Those in favour of section 25 standing as part of the bill please rise.

Those opposed will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 60. The "nays" are 33.

Mr. Chairman: I declare section 25 as part of the bill.

Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to any other section of this bill and, if so, which section?

The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Yes, section 28.

Mr. Chairman: Section 28; anything before section 28? All right, we've carried up to section 28.

The hon. member for Wentworth on section 28.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I missed section 27.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we'll revert to section 27.

Mr. Deans: In section 27, I want to clearly understand what this means. I am referring now to page 16 of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Page 16?

Mr. Deans: After (d) it says:

> but no person shall be deemed to have contravened this subsection by reason of any act or thing done or omitted in relation to a person employed or proposed to be employed in a managerial or confidential capacity.

Now, I don't understand that. What do you mean: "or propose to be employed"? You either are or you're not "employed in a managerial or confidential capacity." You can't be "proposed to be employed" in it. I would like to ask the minister what it is that that means? It makes no sense to me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I understand the hon. member's difficulty in interpreting the section.

Mr. Deans: All right, proposed by whom?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am quoting:

> No person who is acting on behalf of the employer shall participate in or interfere with the selection, formation or administration of an employee organization.

Mr. Deans: No, no! Hold on. I'm sorry; you are on the wrong page.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Section 27?

Mr. Deans: On page 16. Section 27, page 16; where the section begins: "but no person shall be deemed to have contravened this subsection." You see it? It's the fourth paragraph from the top. Right after section (d).

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I see.

Mr. Deans: Okay? Now, in the third line it says: "to a person employed or proposed to

be employed". What is meant by that? "Proposed to be employed".

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: "To be employed in a managerial or confidential capacity."

Mr. Deans: What is meant by "proposed to be employed in a managerial or confidential capacity"? I would understand what it says if it said: "In relation to a person employed in a managerial or confidential capacity." That, I understand. I don't know what you mean when you put in there: "or proposed to be employed."

I suspect that that widens the scope to such an extent that it includes anything. If the government decides that a person's "proposed to be employed" and has made a decision, you just simply say: "That includes you. Don't worry about it."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, it would be in the case of a situation that had not been finally determined by the tribunal with respect to a person "proposed to be employed in a managerial" capacity.

Mr. Deans: Well, I'm not any clearer.

All right. The section deals with the interference with employee organizations; and interference with employees' rights are prohibited. It says: "The employer, or any person acting on behalf of the employer shall not;" and it goes through a number of things: "Refuse to employ or to continue to employ or discriminate against—impose any condition on an appointment or in a contract of employment that seeks to restrain an employee — seek by intimidation, by threat of dismissal or by any other kind of threat—refuse to employ or to continue to employ or discriminate against the person with regard to employment only because the person refused to make a contribution—on behalf of any political party—" And it says:

> but no person shall be deemed to have contravened this subsection by reason of any act or thing done or omitted in relation to a person employed or proposed to be employed in a managerial or confidential capacity.

I just don't understand the "proposed" part. I frankly don't. I don't know why it is in there. It's a second part; it's the little bit that says "proposed to be." That makes no sense to me; I am sorry; it makes no sense whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me see if I can shed some light on it, Mr. Chairman, to show you how co-operative we are on this side of the House. We are prepared to delete those words, "or proposed to be employed."

Mr. Deans: Oh!

Mr. Chairman: Will the minister make the motion?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I move that subsection 3 of section 27 be amended by striking out all those words after "employed" in the third line.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): You just want to delete the words "or proposed to be employed."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: "Or proposed to be employed," yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: But you don't want the words "in a valid managerial or confidential capacity" taken out.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no. That's right. To start again, I move that subsection 3 of section 27 be amended by striking out all those words after the word "employed" in the third line.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the minister's motion will please say "aye."

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The Liberals amend words, we amend whole clauses.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): There is no end to your talents.

Mr. Chairman: Section 27, as amended, will stand as part of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Section 27, as amended, agreed to.

Now, on section 28.

Mr. Singer: Whatever are you going to do next?

Mr. Deans: Oh, you never can tell. It is like a "may-to-shall" amendment.

I find section 28 a little difficult to take over—

Mr. Singer: Why bother?

Mr. Deans: Well, it is one of those very important amendment, that's all.

Section 28 reads:

> An employee organization shall not act in a manner that is arbitrary, discriminatory or in bad faith in the representation

of any of the employees, whether members of the employee organization or not.

I am concerned that there isn't a companion section dealing with the employer's responsibilities to do or not to do these very things. I think that there ought to be—and this goes through sections 28 and 29; it goes beyond that into sections 42 and 43, where we deal with those things that the employee representatives must do. But nowhere in the bill can I find anything that says the employer shall not act in a manner that is arbitrary, discriminatory or in bad faith in the negotiations with the employees.

Obviously I can't amend that section because it deals with a little different matter, but I would say to the minister that there ought to be in this bill—and I will move it at some appropriate point—a section that deals with the employer's responsibilities, that sets out explicitly the employer's responsibilities to act in a manner that is not arbitrary, not discriminatory, not in bad faith during the period that negotiations are taking place and between.

I say to the minister that it worries me when I read through the bill and find the position being put forward in so many different places that an employee organization "shall not," the employee organization "shall do," the employee organization is "subject to fines for offences under the Act," but nowhere in the bill can I find any companion provision dealing with the responsibilities of the employer.

I wonder if the minister has given thought to having such a provision in this bill—explicit not implicit.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I am not going to make any reference to what is implicit or explicit except to say that in the sections to which the hon. member made reference we are talking about employees. And this can only affect the bargaining agent, it can't affect the Crown.

Mr. Deans: Why, the Crown can be sued?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, but in this instance we don't represent the employees.

Mr. Deans: No, you represent the—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The bargaining agent represents the employees.

Mr. Deans: Does the minister not think that there has to be an equal obligation on the employer to act in the same way, to act in good faith, to act in a non-discriminatory way to ensure that there is no arbitrary action that is detrimental to the employee during negotiations? Doesn't he feel that there is an obligation on the employer to have that spelled out in the Act?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would I not be right in suggesting to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that the provisions of section 42 might also deal with that situation?

Mr. Deans: Well I'm going to deal with 42 next, and it doesn't, you see; that is what worries me. In fact, I would be prepared, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Section 7(2), which has already been passed, requires that the parties shall bargain in good faith.

Mr. Deans: Oh, yes, that's fine. It requires the parties shall bargain in good faith, but I find it extremely difficult to understand why it is necessary to set out in the bill the responsibilities of the employees' organization while not establishing similar responsibilities for the employer; for not saying that section 7 doesn't in fact guarantee that they will bargain in good faith, it doesn't guarantee it at all. It says there is an obligation to bargain, but it doesn't say that anything will happen if they don't.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well I think the government's good faith in bargaining is covered in section 7(2), as I've pointed out, and I believe the grievance procedure protects the employees. I don't see any need for what the hon. member is proposing in this particular instance.

Mr. Deans: I feel that it is evidence of the general attitude that employees' organizations and employees have to have spelled out for them the rules that will govern their behaviour. But we all know that the government always acts in the best of things, we need never ever spell out any rules governing their behaviour in negotiations because we all know that they will act in the most suitable, satisfactory manner in dealing across the bargaining table at negotiation time.

I just feel that if you find it necessary to write these clauses in—and section 42 is the one that I want to deal with next—there ought to be explicit in the Act the same obligations on the part of the government and its agencies to deal fairly and in a non-discriminatory way with the employees.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I just join into the debate for a moment to suggest, as a mat-

ter of record, that the government does intend to be arbitrary.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It does?

Mr. Bullbrook: It does intend to be arbitrary.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You suggest incorrectly.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I say to you it is the philosophy of the minister defending this piece of legislation that the Crown is paramount—and he might well be right—that under the reservations of the management's right sections you intend to be arbitrary. You are going to make decisions of not a bilateral nature but a totally unilateral nature. You are going to say: "I direct and manage the work force of the Province of Ontario."

I must say basically what concerns me more than anything else about the whole exercise, is that you make a valid point that there is no reciprocity here, that basically what the member for Wentworth is saying is that there is a semblance of a lack of fairness there, that you are burdening employee organizations with the sanctimony of not acting in an arbitrary fashion but you are not coincidentally burdening the employer with that. I think when you do get to section 42 you will beg the ultimate question as to what we can do about that, because I just wonder frankly, even if you had a reciprocal section in there that burdened the Crown with not being arbitrary or not being discriminatory, what would be the end result, if they were? I wonder about 42; I am going to be interested in listening to the debate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Have they reached 42 yet?

Mr. Bullbrook: No, but if we carry forward and applaud the desires of the hon. member for Wentworth, and if we write reciprocal sections, then they are only effective because of the punitive aspects of 42. As to the punitive aspects of 42, I wonder whether they can be directed against the Crown, because how does the Crown fine the Crown? The Crown, through its judiciary and its ability to police its own statutes, can fine a person, an individual or an employees' organization, but I just wonder whether it can fine itself. If it can, it is almost ludicrous. It is certainly circuitous anyway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, if I might direct the hon. member's attention to section 30, it is a long section but it occurs to me that the employees' protections are well spelled out here. According to 30(1):

> The tribunal may appoint an investigator with authority to inquire into a complaint that,
>
> (a) a person has been refused employment, discharged, discriminated against, threatened, coerced, intimidated or otherwise dealt with contrary to this Act as to his employment, opportunity for employment or conditions of employment;

and so on.

Mr. Deans: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have decided—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: With the other matters that I have also referred to, his interests are well protected.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's a matter of opinion.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Of course.

Mr. Deans: I have decided that I will, in fact, move an amendment in order to try to satisfy my own concerns about the relationship between the government and its employees.

I move that section 28 be renumbered section 28(a), and that a subsection (b) be added: "The employer or his agents shall not act in a manner that is arbitrary, discriminatory or in bad faith in negotiating with the employees' representatives."

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Deans moves that section 28 be amended and renumbered as section 28(a), and that a subsection (b) be added to read: "The employer or his agents shall not act in a manner that is arbitrary, discriminatory or in bad faith in negotiating with the employees' representatives."

Mr. Bullbrook: May I direct a question, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member for Wentworth to assist me? I sympathize, if I may say, with the intention, as I said before, but I regard it as a redundancy to burden a person or an organization—a person in this instance. The definition section of "employer" is Her Majesty in right of Ontario.

Really, how efficacious is this? I am worried that you just can't fine yourself. The Crown cannot bring itself to court. It just can't do it; it's traditional it can't. When we get to 42, I think you are going to recognize that what you've done is meritorious but, as I say, I don't think efficacious.

Mr. Deans: I am not going to try to enter into that kind of an argument.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why don't you?

Mr. Deans: I am not going to argue with you whether or not it will, in fact, prove to make any difference to the way negotiations are carried out, except—

Mr. Gisborn: Let's move that we delete it and let's have another vote.

Mr. Deans: —that I say to you, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Gisborn: Delete it altogether.

Mr. Deans: —there ought to be set out in the Act responsibilities of the employer towards the employees. I think that under section 42, recognizing that the Management Board of cabinet is the representative of the Crown in most instances and that there are Crown agencies representative of the Crown in other instances, they should be made subject to the same fines as set out in 42, for any breach of this Act.

Mr. Bullbrook: The point, if I may, if the member would be kind enough—

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: —is that your amendment isn't doing this. Your new section refers to employer, you see.

Mr. Deans: Yes, but there is—

Mr. Bullbrook: And employer is defined as "Her Majesty in right of Ontario", so you are not affecting the participants in the Management Board at all, you are affecting that large compass of the Crown, in this new section, who are not subject to anything of a punitive nature at all.

I don't know how you would frame it, but I suggest most respectfully to the hon. member that I think basically what he is wanting to assure is that those who carry out the responsibility of collective bargaining and negotiations within the Management Board function should act without arbitrariness.

Mr. Deans: I said "the employer or his agent."

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh, I'm sorry, did you?

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: Then I think that really the words "the employer" are redundant, but that does help, "or his agent".

Mr. Deans: Yes, I had "the employer or his agent."

Mr. Bullbrook: It would have to be "or its agent." It is a matter of semantics.

Mr. Deans: I believe it says "or its agent."

Mr. Bullbrook: Well that helps.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if I may, the immense value of that kind of amendment—apart from the clear parallelism with section 12 of the Ontario Labour Relations Act, a parallelism which the government might wish to uphold—the immense value of it is how it would apply to the arbitration board. It would allow an arbitration board to take into account, in the process of arbitrating, the behaviour of management in good faith terms, as it affected the subjects under arbitration, as well as the behaviour of the employees. While I agree with the hon. member for Sarnia—and it is an interesting subject for section 42—that to take the Crown to court is awkward, nonetheless for an arbitration board to be able to turn to the Act and say that there was an equal onus on the agent of the Crown engaged in bargaining to bargain in good faith, that that is an important thing for an arbitration board under this Act to have to turn to, and would clearly support the right of the employees.

Mr. Deans: I also want, Mr. Chairman, if I may, to make—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wonder if I might comment on that just for a moment?

Mr. Deans: I'll just finish with this and you can comment on it all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, you're not finished? I see.

Mr. Deans: I point to section 1(2) which says that: "The employer may be represented, in the case of the public service, by the Management Board of cabinet, and in the case of an agency of the Crown, by the body designated by the regulations." So in fact then the action would be taken against the person who was designated.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have a comment?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I still fail to see the necessity for this. I have already made

reference to the grievance procedures. I think the way the employer manages or performs as far as his employee is concerned is fully covered by the grievance procedure and the grievance procedure then is bargainable. That is perfectly normal. I think it is normal in the private sector. I would think the Labour Relations Act would make similar provisions.

The grievance procedure which is set out and which we have already gone through is a matter that is bargainable. As a matter of fact it is a matter that was expanded during the sessions of the standing committee to include not only those matters that were set out in the section as grievable, but also those matters which were written into a collective agreement. So it seems to me the employee is fully protected in that manner.

Mr. Chairman: There is some doubt about the appropriateness of the motion, but due to the legal arguments, which are over my head, we'll place the question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was interested in the debate between the two other parties. I enjoyed it very much.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of Mr. Deans' motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

I declare the motion lost and section 28 stands as part of the bill.

Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to the bill before we get to section 42?

Sections 29 to 41 agreed to.

On section 42:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. In section 42 again, as in the other sections, the responsibility for actions contravening the Act by the employee or his organization is clearly spelled out. There is no indication as to what happens in case of the employer who does not live up to his obligations.

Under section 42(1) it says: "Every person who contravenes any provision of this Act is guilty of an offence, and on summary conviction," etc. It then goes on to say, in subsection 2: "Every employee organization." It goes on again in subsection 3 to say: "If an employee organization is guilty." And it goes on in the following section 43 to say: "A prosecution for an offence may be brought against an employee organization in the name of that organization."

And I want to suggest to the minister that it ought to include the employer. There should be spelled out in that section the obligation of the employer in the event that he, through his agent—through its agent, if you prefer—contravenes any section of the Act. If the agent of the employer contravenes any section of the Act, that agent should be subject to the same penalties as the agent of the employee.

To say on the one hand in subsection 2 that the employee organization is subject to fines of $5,000 if it contravenes an Act—and not more than $5,000, but certainly up to $5,000—or any individual is subject to a fine of $500 for each day if he contravenes the Act; or to tie the employee organization in on the contravening of any section of the Act in such a way as to make them as guilty as the person who breaks the law; as I point out in section 43 that "a prosecution for an offence may be brought against an employee organization in the name of that organization;" clearly spells out the kind of punitive nature of the bill.

It points out quite clearly the fact that all of the onus is on the employee organizations, with none of the responsibility resting with management. And I again suggest to the minister that there should be a section in there, perhaps section 43(a), that says: "A prosecution for an offence may be brought against an employer's agent in the name of the employer."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: To whom or what would the hon. member be referring when he says an "agent"—to whom is he referring?

Mr. Deans: I'm referring to the chairman and the Management Board of cabinet, for example, if they are the bargaining agent for the employer. I'm referring to any Crown agencies established for the purpose of managing any operation.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just let me ask the hon. member another question. When he referred to the Management Board, of course, he's referring to a committee of cabinet. Does his observation still stand?

Mr. Deans: Sure! Yes!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, we'll pursue that. If you're going to move something, go ahead.

Mr. Deans: I'm not going to go ahead. I'm not supposed to make a motion.

Mr. Lewis: No, you don't have to make a motion. The minister should just answer him.

Mr. Deans: Tell me why; tell me why you're not equally responsible.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I'd have to ask the hon. member, through you, Mr. Chairman, and indeed the House, how the Crown can be put in such a position, or the government as an agent of the Crown?

Mr. Deans: You already are in that position.

Mr. Lewis: You are in that position.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me pursue that a little further. Suppose there was a punitive section put in there in the sense that has been suggested—the fine was $5,000 a day. Now what kind of enforcement is that; because where does the money come from? It comes out of one pocket and goes right into another one. Quite frankly it does. Now let's be frank and practical about this. I suggest that the final arbiter in these situations is the Legislature itself.

Mr. Deans: No!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have rather a different attitude about the Legislature than my hon. member does—

Mr. Deans: I think my colleague—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —because I regard the Legislature as—

Mr. Deans: I think my colleague probably has a good idea. In the case of the employer, we'll make it a term in jail.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But I rather regard the Legislature as the Supreme Court of this particular jurisdiction.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but you've already done it elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I don't follow the hon. member's thinking in this area. I can't follow it. I can't for the life of me follow it. I think that's what the hon. member for Sarnia was making reference to a little earlier. I can't follow that type of thinking.

Mr. Lewis: Okay! Mr. Chairman, there is in this Act, the Crown Employees Bargaining Act, a clear reference to questions of layoff; and the fact that they are a managerial prerogative. Right? All right?

Now, in the Employment Standards Act, part II discusses termination of employment. And the first section under that is section 12; and let me read you section 12.

This part applies to the Crown. It says:

> Every agency thereof and any board, commission, authority or corporation that exercises any functions assigned or delegated to it by the Crown—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And what are the penalties?

Mr. Lewis: I'm coming to that. Which in clear terms means that you, the Management Board, are subject to the provisions of the Employment Standards Act of this government in the way in which you exercise your authority around the layoff sections of this Crown employees' Act.

Then, under the same Employment Standards Act there is a section called, "Enforcement," part XII; section 42 says:

> Every employer who dismisses . or threatens to dismiss or otherwise discriminates against an employee because the employee has sought the enforcement of this Act or the regulations, or has given information to a person authorized to require it under this Act, is guilty of an offence and on summary conviction is liable to a fine of not more than $1,000.
>
> Where an employer is convicted of the offence of dismissing an employee under one of the circumstances mentioned in subsection 1, the provincial judge . . . shall order the employer to reinstate the employee. . . . Any employer who fails to comply with an order made under subsection 2 is guilty of an offence and on summary conviction is liable to a fine not exceeding $50 for each day during which the failure continues.

There are some rather interesting subsections further under section 43, which may indeed also apply. I'm just trying to see the categories. It says:

> Where an employer is convicted of an offence respecting the wages, hours of work, vacation pay or conditions of work of one or more of the employees, the offence against each employee shall be deemed to be a separate offence for the purposes of subsection 1.

No, that wouldn't apply, but the previous section would.

Mr. Singer: Is there a definition of "employer" in the definitions section?

Mr. Lewis: I would have thought that when the termination of employment applies to the Crown, the Crown would have to be considered an employer. You are wondering about the definitions section.

> "Employer" includes any person who, as the owner, proprietor, manager, superintendent or overseer of any activity, business, work, trade, occupation or profession, has control or direction over or is directly or indirectly responsible for the employment of a person therein.

I would have thought that overseer would be that part of the definition of employer which would apply to the Crown that exercises functions—

Mr. Singer: Yes, but I don't think you will find that the Crown is a person.

Mr. Bullbrook: I congratulate the leader of the New Democratic Party for looking into the Employment Standards Act, but I don't think we have to go that far really.

Mr. Lewis: Probably not.

Mr. Bullbrook: If you apply section 25, the lockout provision which my colleague from Downsview is just bringing to my attention and which is in this statute itself, then if there is a lockout by the employer under section 25, then theoretically you are subject to the punitive aspects of section 42.

But I think basically what this is—and I realize that ultimately the judiciary might have to decide this—but basically all this is a statement of principle. Where there is great validity therefore in what the member says is if they are prepared to establish principles without any efficacy, as I see it—but I might well be wrong. And what is wrong with carrying that principle further?

Again, why didn't the government support the proposed addition to section 28? Why doesn't the government consider amplifying an obligation in the penalty section, No. 42, even if it is only an obligation of principle itself? That is where I do subscribe to what the member says, because if we are correct on this side, the Crown cannot fine itself; it just can't, it's impossible so to do. Under the Employment Standards Act, I believe, the member is quite right. They can effectuate, through the provincial judge, certain positive and mandatory requirements, such as reinstatement and the repayment of back pay, but I don't think they can fine themselves.

Mr. Lewis: I can see that line of argument, and I must say that I am simply trying to make the case that there are parallels and precedents which, were the government wishing to act in good faith, it could.

Were the government wishing to act in good faith at court; were the government wishing to demonstrate publicly that it felt itself in a bilateral position rather than an arbitrary position, it could do so, and that could colour all the proceedings which subsequently arrayed themselves before an arbitration board. It would colour the negotiation process. It would say to the world at large that the employees are not being put in a permanent subsidiary status, but we understand the obligations on the Crown and although they may be more difficult to enforce, we will at least go so far as to lay them out as far as we are able.

You have rejected that by your refusal to accept the amendment to clause 28 from the member for Wentworth, and you are rejecting it by your refusal to include a parallelism in clause 42. In effect, Mr. Chairman, what you are saying is that there is implicit in the statute certain protections which deal with the good faith of the government.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say to the minister, whom are you kidding? You've taken away the right to strike. You're forcing compulsory arbitration. You have the toughest managerial rights clause in any piece of legislation issuing from this government. How can you pretend that the Crown is seriously interested in protecting the rights of its employees?

Only by a positive Act which binds you to some kind of equivalent moral commitments in the collective bargaining process can one see that good faith on your part. It's clearly not there because you're denying every amendment which is put.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just a word; let's assume a situation where there is a layoff. As I have expressed myself before, but maybe not properly, if there is a layoff, there is a grievance. As I suggested before, what good would a fine do? It doesn't really mean anything. I would suggest to you that I would sooner pay the largest fine that could be thought of than face the censure of the Legislature for that type of misconduct. I would. If the other members of this Legislature don't feel as I do, then I say they should feel that way. Just let me add—

Mr. Deans: What would happen then?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just let me add this, Mr. Chairman. A person representing management in this instance can be found guilty of an offence under section 42, subsection 2, but I cannot for the life of me see any merit in setting out a special section to do what is proposed by the hon. member. What good does it do?

I repeat that I would far sooner pay a fine than face the censure of the Legislature as a member of the government for breaching a statute passed by the Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: But putting you in jail is a much better way.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the minister agree that the lockout provision, therefore, is redundant, superfluous?

Mr. Lewis: Sure.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is.

Mr. Lewis: What happens?

Mr. Bullbrook: What happens to you? Aside from the context of this chamber, what happens to you? What hapens to the Crown if you lock them out? Nothing?

Mr. Lewis: Not a thing. My colleague from Hamilton East said it would be better to be put in jail.

Mr. Singer: We all get up and make speeches and howl at you. That is what happens.

Mr. Bullbrook: So it's superfluous.

Mr. Deans: Subsection 2 of 42 doesn't deal with the employer at all. It says "every employee organization." That has nothing to do with the employer.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I said employee.

Mr. Singer: You can't fine the Crown.

Mr. Deans: It only affects employee organizations.

An hon. member: Why would you have to face the Legislature? You're not guilty of anything.

Mr. Deans: It doesn't make any difference. You're wrong.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Deans: You must be wrong.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 42 stand as part of the bill?

All those in favour of section 42 standing as part of the bill will please say "aye."

All opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Section 42 agreed to.

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh, goodness gracious.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Watch your language.

Mr. Bullbrook: What is wrong with goodness gracious?

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions or amendments on any other section?

The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Yes, section 54.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before section 54? If not, we're carried up to section 54. The hon. member for Wentworth on section 54.

Mr. Deans: I am going to move an amendment and then I want to speak to it for a moment.

I move that clause 54 of Bill 105 be amended by deleting the words, "Collective Bargaining," and substituting therefor the words: "Compulsory Arbitration," so that the clause will read: "This Act may be cited as the Crown Employees Compulsory Arbitration Act, 1972."

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It sort of brings it home to you!

Mr. Deans: I know that will be acceptable. Is it acceptable? It's not acceptable?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The short title is quite satisfactory.

Mr. Deans: That's what it is.

Mr. Gisborn: What kind of collective bargaining is this?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you that I consider this to be the worst piece of legislation that I have ever seen in this House. I think you understand how I feel about the bill. I want to say to you further that I consider this CSAO as a part of the legislation. I consider that they have played as much of a role in making sure the legislation went through as they did in opposing it. I don't think there is another employee organization—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I thought it made significant representation on this bill.

Mr. Deans: —I don't think there is another employee organization anywhere in the province—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And many other people thought that, too.

Mr. Deans: —which would have accepted this kind of legislation were it to be thrust upon them by this government in the way that the CSAO has accepted this.

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): The public are happy to accept it.

Mr. Deans: And I am—the public are not happy.

Mr. MacBeth: Sure, they are happy.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): That is a reactionary way of thinking.

Mr. Gisborn: The public doesn't understand it.

Mr. Deans: I say to you I feel that the bill is misnamed. It carries within it every—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You can be on your side, I will be on the people's side every day of the week.

Mr. Deans: —piece of repressive legislation that could possibly be enacted in labour relations. It has within the bill every single clause that could be used against employees to inhibit their rights, to destroy their collective bargaining position and to make sure that they are unable to voice publicly their disapproval of actions of this government. I say to the minister that this legislation would have been disastrous in 1892. It is even worse in 1972.

This is the kind of thing that one might have expected back in the days of the militant strikes across the Province of Ontario. I say to the Chairman that to call this An Act to provide for Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees is to misname it. There is nothing in here that provides for collective bargaining and all the Act does, in fact, is remove the right of collective bargaining for employees in the Province of Ontario.

It takes away rights that the employees have had over the years. It establishes restrictions that heretofore have never been established and it guarantees that the employee will have no say in the determination of what, in fact, goes on in the place of employment as it affects his day-to-day life.

I am saying to you that the name of the Act, An Act to provide for Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees, is in itself a misnomer and ought to be changed. It is quite clearly an Act to provide for compulsory arbitration for Crown employees. And that's all it is! It is so poorly thought out—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I totally disagree!

Mr. Deans: —inadequately drafted, that I say to you that the whole bill is a disgrace—

Mr. Gisborn: It needs a whole new approach!

Mr. Deans: —to this Legislature. I hesitate to tell you what I really think of it for fear that I would be ruled out of order. I really do!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Nothing but—

Mr. Deans: I think that throughout the bill I have seen the evidence of the most reactionary government attitude toward negotiation. Throughout the bill I have seen evidence of this government's inability to understand the changes in the negotiation patterns. I have seen evidence in this bill of this government's inability to understand the ever-increasing awareness of the people of the Province of Ontario of their responsibility to the growth of this province.

The Crown employees deserve better than this. They deserve better than this from the government and they deserve better than the token opposition that has been put forward by their representatives. I am going to say to you that this bill will some day come back to haunt you. We will oppose it.

Mr. Lewis: There is already a spectre haunting the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) and there will be one haunting you.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to say in that connection that, really, I didn't regard the representations made by the CSAO, and especially by their solicitor, as tokenism. I thought they were very effective.

The thing that came through to me more than anything else in connection with the committee hearings on this statute was the lack of interest and initiative on the part of organized labour. Where were they, I say?

When you are starting to erode their rights with a statute of this nature—and this is the beginning, not the end of the government's posture on collective bargaining, and compulsory arbitration—I wonder where the

trade union movement was. Because CUPE came before us—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The only one.

Mr. Bullbrook: The only one.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: For one hour, one day.

Mr. Bullbrook: For one hour on one day.

Mr. Chairman: We are off this—

Mr. Bullbrook: We might well be off it; I want to have the opportunity, if I may, to sit down right now, but before I do I just want to say I wanted to record that, because many of us thought about it. Maybe it was tokenism by CSAO; I didn't think it was. But boy, organized labour in the Province of Ontario let themselves down very, very badly by not taking a more overt interest in this statute and its implications.

Mr. Singer: Where was the Ontario Federation of Labour—David Archer and all the rest of you fellows?

Mr. Gisborn: You haven't missed it for the last five years.

Mr. Singer: Where were they?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In Montreal, I would think.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, if this were a prospectus before the Ontario Securities Commission that had the heading, "Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act," I am sure it would be rejected, because it would be a misleading representation. I think it is a shame that this minister doesn't put a title on this bill, as the member for Wentworth has said, that describes what it is.

I am really disappointed, because normally this minister is pretty honest and straightforward in what he puts forward in any legislation. But I am sorry in this one he is misleading both the civil service and the public of this province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no, Mr. Chairman, this is the last section; I reserve the right to just say a few words.

There is no attempt to mislead the House. I have said it before. I have said it in committee, if not in the House. I'll say it now. I believe in collective bargaining. I believe in it very much—

Mr. Bounsall: But you have the upper hand all the way along.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But I also say to you, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the strike route is the way to settle all differences.

Mr. Lewis: Nobody disagrees with you.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And that is what I mean—that is the difference between my opinion on collective bargaining and the hon. members'.

Mr. Stokes: No, but you start from a position of equality. This bill doesn't give this.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the reason—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And I'm not alone in that opinion either.

Mr. Lewis: It's a ridiculous assertion at this point of the bill because nobody anywhere now believes that the strike is the sole solution to labour disputes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What are you beefing about?

Mr. Lewis: Even George Meany agrees with you—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What are you beefing about then?

Mr. Lewis: —and as a matter of fact so he should because you share a lot of philosophic views in common—

Mr. Stokes: You don't have to agree but you must start as equals.

Mr. Lewis: —the minister and George Meany. When I look at the minister I see and hear George Meany.

Mr. Bullbrook: You ask us what we beef about; you won't give us the opportunity. I'm sorry.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the reason that the title of the bill is so inappropriate and offensive and such a clear misrepresentation, as the hon. member for York Centre has put it, is that you have destroyed the collective bargaining process which you pretend to enshrine. There is no collective bargaining process in this bill.

The fact that you have removed the right to strike means that you have denied to workers the withdrawal of their labour, which in most situations is the final conclusion of the strike process, but need not be in all situations.

All right; that's one area where the collective bargaining process as we know it is violated. But it is nothing compared to what you have done to the arbitration process, where you have stacked the arbitration board in favour of management before you've started. Where you have confined the matters that can be discussed before arbitration to the most picayune details which hardly affect in a fundamental way the economic conditions of the work force.

And having done that to the strike and having done that to the arbitration process you have then, under section 17, brought in a managerial rights clause which removes from collective bargaining most of the areas around which collective bargaining now takes place in this society.

So how can you pretend to call it in any sense a bill for the collective bargaining of Crown employees? It is a bill to straitjacket Crown employees. A bill to arrange for a serf relationship with government for Crown employees. A bill to establish the unilateral authority of the Crown in the bargaining process with its employees. A bill, at the very least, to establish compulsory arbitration for its employees.

Any one of those is a more adequate and accurate description of what you have engaged in in this bill, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, than that by which you have titled it. The title is meant to mislead, to seduce, to lull, to pretend, but you just take a look at those clauses.

More than half the clauses of this bill violate the collective bargaining process. It is as though the minister has read nothing of the federal task force on labour, nothing of the provincial discussions on labour relations which have taken place, most of the discussions on the amendments to the Ontario Labour Relations Act. And many of those amendments, as much as we found certain of them repugnant, are light-years ahead of what you have allowed for your own civil service in the Province of Ontario.

Yes, I'll concede it: This bill bodes ill for collective bargaining in the private sector as well as the public sector. And the trade union movement in this province will have to come to recognize that. Because it is applied purely to the civil servants of Ontario doesn't mean that it doesn't have sorry implications for the rest of the workers in the province. And I suspect that the chairman of the Management Board will be rather quick to see that certain principles here enshrined are extended to other sectors of the collective bargaining community.

This is a really objectionable bill. My, it's an objectionable bill. And we've all felt frustrated about debating it. You can't debate with this minister. He doesn't care about the bill. He doesn't know what's in the bill. He hasn't thought about the bill. The government has clearly viewed this bill as a simple ringing down of strictures.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are uptight these days.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I'm quite uptight about this legislation. No, as a matter of fact, I have one small matter which causes me some anxiety from time to time, apart from the Legislature, and now this bill in the Legislature. You're not going to probe the private recesses of my life, are you?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, and don't assume some of the private thoughts I have either. Do me the same courtesy.

Mr. Lewis: Right. So as it now stands, the thing that causes me aggravation is this piece of legislation—

Mr. Stokes: You would do well to be more preoccupied with this legislation; it is irresponsible legislation.

Mr. Lewis: With respect to the minister, Mr. Chairman, usually I remember him as Treasurer, when he came in with Treasury Board bills. I remember him as Minister of Highways, as Minister of Transportation and Communications; he was armed with dossiers of facts and knowledge and he treated section after section with a grasp which all of us were willing to concede, even if we disagreed with it.

This bill to the minister is an administrative trifle. It's a nuisance which he has brought forth in his capacity, dealt with all 54 or however many sections there are and simply said, "There'll be no significant amendments. We won't deal with it in any considered way."

It is very difficult to engage him in debate; in fact, it's a matter of some chagrin that the minister is so self-satisfied about it, clearly having the pre-arranged acquiescence of the civil service or at least of the association—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are going to come to trouble with those kinds of observations.

Mr. Deans: It is true, Charlie. It is.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry, it is obviously true. He is not prepared to debate it further. We will divide the House once finally, Mr. Chairman, on the last section because the last section is a misnomer if ever there was one, and the minister knows it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Okay. Divide the House.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions then?

Those in favour of Mr. Dean's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Deans moves that clause 54 of Bill 105 be amended by deleting the words "collective bargaining," and substituting therefore the words "compulsory arbitration" so that the clause will read "This Act may be cited as the Crown Employees Compulsory Arbitration Act, 1972."

The committee divided on the amendment which was negatived.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 32, the "nays" 54.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and section 54 shall stand as part of the bill.

Shall the bill, as amended, be reported?

Carried.

Bill 105 reported.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I direct the attention of the House to the fact that a message from the Lieutenant Governor relating to this bill as required by standing order 86 has been received.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs): I move that the committee rise and report.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Shall the motion carry?

Carried.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report a certain bill as amended, together with a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 105, An Act to provide for Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. Hodgson in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

(*continued*)

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned last Friday I was going through the minister's opening statement in a systematic way. Before I continue along those lines there are a few brief comments I would like to add at this time.

While I was proofreading the instant Hansard on Monday morning I came across the minister's interjection about my speech being written by Walter Pitman. At the time of the interjection, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid my temper got slightly the better of me and I retorted rather angrily that the minister's comment was a palpable slander.

On serious reconsideration, of course, I realize that the minister's interjection, although unfounded, wasn't a slander at all. It was in fact one of the finest compliments I have ever received and I will take it in that spirit, Mr. Chairman. It is obviously the spirit in which the minister intended it.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Change the instant Hansard.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): The former Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) wrote the minister's opening statement.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to continue. When I finished last Friday I said I hoped that the emphasis wasn't merely on the repeating of the word quality; and now to continue to examine the minister's statement.

On page 11 of his statement the minister says: "Local decision-making is spreading." I would suggest with some humility that the local decision-making is spreading in spite of the ministry's actions not because of it, or present policies.

Again, on page 11, the minister talks about curriculum development. I have spoken previously on this topic about the time and the energy that is needed for curriculum development. No account of this is taken in the minister's statement.

On pages 12 and 13—on those comments and on the minister's statements there—I would like to say frankly that we in this party thoroughly endorse and congratulate the minister on the circulation of Circulars 14 and 15. We feel that this is a very valuable service and we feel that it is proper and right that they should be distributed to each and every teacher in the province. We feel that this is the only way in which the grassroots—well, maybe not the grassroots but the bottom of the stalk, at least—has a genuine contribution to the curriculum development.

I would like to make a small suggestion here, if I may. Perhaps the minister could get together with the Minister for Government Services (Mr. Snow) and whoever is responsible for keeping the Canadian book industry alive, and hope that they adopt the suggestion that was made by Mr. William French in the Globe and Mail last week. That suggestion was to adopt the practice currently used by the French government, which awards every newly married couple a set of six books.

I would suggest that the Ontario government do this, in line with its awarding of plaques and scrolls to people who have reached landmarks in their lives—such as 50th or 60th wedding anniversaries, 90th birthdays and so on. I would think that the government should look seriously at giving copies of six books of interest to Canadians to each newly married couple.

Some titles obviously leap to mind: "Trap Lines North," which deals with a trapping family north of Nakina; "The Shy Photographer," by Jock Carroll, a book that deals with the experiences of an Indian who comes from north of Sioux Lookout and finds himself working as a photographer for a magazine that has an uncanny resemblance to Life magazine. I think that particular book would be of tremendous interest to many newly married couples. A book such as Susannah Moody's "Roughing It in the Bush", I would suggest, should be distributed just in case the couples can't get decent housing—as it is not being provided by the present government—and they might find themselves camping out a good deal in this great Province of Ontario.

Of course, I think the present government would undoubtedly like to distribute copies of Dalton Camp's book, "Gentlemen, Players and Politicians." I think that would be a very worthwhile contribution to the newly married couples of this province.

I would like to suggest that the government also consider several titles of Canadian poetry, Irving Layton's "Love Where the Nights Are Long." I think that would be a very appropriate gift for newly married couples.

And some other anthologies obviously leap to mind, such as "Poetry of Our Time". I would like to see particularly an anthology which contains a poem that was carried recently in the Canadian Forum, a poem that was entitled: "An Ode to Bill Davis". I would like to read that to you in its entirety, just to give you the full flavour of what a newly married couple in this province would be reading, about the Premier (Mr. Davis) especially, if the government adopted this suggestion of mine:

Ode to Bill Davis

There is a photograph, a serious squinting
Boy, not yet fat, clutching a spade with some
Primeval sense of earth and ditches.
A Brampton boy who must have dreamt his dreams
Of horse pounding, open sky and land,
Of blood-stained heroes set against the dying sun.

He must have run, been lithe, chased girls, skipped school,
Or did the Brampton elders frown and send him
Neatly off to find that five and six do not make twelve?

The young man grew to awkward diffidence;
The elders taught him well. The hands still gesture
Towards the reins, the eyes still squint, but there is
No wildness now. Instead a heavy-lidded
Figure basks in white fluorescent light,
And sometimes licks its lips.

We saw him with the late show,
We saw him with the news,
Bill Davis makes things happen,
Bill Davis cures the blind.
He rides a big white horse,
He runs along the beach.
Forget dead Jack and Bobby,
The gulls cry out for Bill.

But never call him William,
Or worse yet Mr. Davis,
For Billy-boy will get you
When you leave the late late show.

In the October dusk the leaves were falling
And we thought, would Walpole have looked thus,
Or Charlemagne?
The cold eyes, the arms raised on awkward victory,
The tightly smiling wife, whose skirts (we heard) were
Too long.

What comfort lies in this flickering image, this sleek
Rotundity of an academic dean, or of a bishop whose cross
Is merely pectoral?

Surely Chinese pilgrims worship fatness, burn their
Incense for a happy idol, navel showing, whose smile
Is painted on.
So that in this cold land, smell of tundra in the air,
We may shuffle dying leaves and affirm the broken dreams
Of Brampton.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): How about that; "The Broken Dreams of Brampton." I think we should all weep.

Mr. Foulds: I think the ministry, along with whatever other government-branches or departments where the ministries are concerned, should in all seriousness actively pursue this suggestion—particularly in view of the slogan that the Premier seems to have adopted from an old Westinghouse commercial that he endorses textbooks written, "for Canadians, by Canadians" and so forth. What better department to undertake this project than the Ministry of Education? It should get it around to the whole community, not just into the textbook aspect of things in schools.

To continue with the minister's statement, on page 14, he says, and I quote again directly: "There is no ceiling on imagination, initiative and innovation in this province".

True enough. There is just a ceiling on the wherewithal with which to implement the programmes designed by the imagination, initiative and innovation in this province. Just the wherewithal with which to do it, and perhaps the time.

To go on, on page 16 the minister says:

> The reactions and recommendations of teachers, pupils and parents are being sought. This has to do with the procedure that all ensure that existing curriculum guidelines are reviewed frequently and systematically. A representative curriculum revision committee is at work this year analysing primary and junior level programmes. This committee includes teachers, parents, principals and other representatives of all levels of education. It also includes representation based on geographic, ethnic and religious factors.

These are extremely fine principles on which to be working. I wonder if the minister, however, could be a little bit more specific. Perhaps we could do this in a little more detail when we get to the specific votes. Would he table for the information of the House who exactly is on the committee; how they were chosen?

I would like to—and I don't put forth this suggestion in a negative or arbitrary way—I would like to ask the minister why there isn't such a committee existing on both the senior level of elementary schools programmes and on the secondary level? If there are no such committees, then perhaps we can have an exchange about that and when they will be set up in the future.

There is a more serious matter, it seems to me, and the minister touches on it on page 18. He talks with a great deal of enthusiasm about the credit system. I think that all of us in this party would agree that the credit system is a step in the right direction. But I would like to point out what the minister says; and I am quoting exactly again on page 19:

> About 80 per cent of Ontario's schools are now at least nominally operating under the new system and this September all secondary schools will be expected to adopt it.

I would like to emphasize the words 80 per cent "nominally operating." And I am a bit afraid about the secondary schools; the other 20 per cent need to raise the total from 80 to 100 per cent. I wonder if the minister expects them to adopt a system in this coming September; also nominally, or will it be a genuine adoption of the system. In other words, what I am afraid of is that the formula may change, but the reality may stay the same; the reality of the rigidity of past systems.

Now, I find myself in a rather ambiguous or ambivalent position here, because as the minister goes on, and I quote:

> Under the credit system there is no rigid core curriculum as such. In a fast-changing world it is impossible to predict

in advance that any given core of basic subjects will provide the specific knowledge and skills that will be essential to the future.

But I wonder, perhaps, if somehow we have not emphasized relevance too much, to the exclusion of other values in education. Surely there are certain skills that need to be taught, and when we begin to discuss the detailed study that was recently revealed—the attitude towards the schools system—there might be the place where we could do this.

Surely, the essential thing is that certain thought processes, intellectual processes, creative processes, need to be developed. I suspect that to develop them, we need specific and concrete materials with which to work. But I am just a little afraid and just a little cautious. I would like to express that caution that I have with regard to this tremendous and seemingly overwhelming emphasis on the relevant. Paraphrasing Stanislavski, that much-misunderstood Russian genius of the theatre: "The words, 'in general,' are the enemy of art and of the intellect."

To continue; on page 20 of the minister's statement, he outlines four categories from which the student may select options. I suspect that in looking at the categories, and I know the difficulty that is encountered here; but the categories tend to be mechanistic rather than organic. Nowhere in that list—now when we look at some of the curriculum development in detail, this may come out—but nowhere in that list is the word "humanities." Nowhere is the idea that languages may be more than the utility or propaganda tools. Nowhere is the idea that language may be a think of beauty that expresses the aspirations and ideals of mankind. And I am reminded of Wordsworth's words about Milton;

> Milton! Thou shouldst be living at this hour:
>
> England hath need of thee—

If I may paraphrase, "Ontario, thou hath need of someone like a Milton at this hour."

On page 20 again, the minister says:

> Needless to say, students intending to go to college or to university must keep admission requirements in mind when selecting their secondary school courses. The same applies to those who intend to seek a particular type of job after completing secondary school.

Now in practice what does this really mean to the student? Let's examine that paragraph for a while. Does that mean that perhaps all of those options which we say are being offered at the secondary school level aren't really open to the students unless they want to wind up in an economic and educational dead-end? And it seems to me it pinpoints the lack of co-ordination and co-operation between the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

We in this province have adopted, in theory at least, the concept of continuous education between kindergarten and grade 13. Surely that is a move in the right direction and should be extended right through the learning process to the end of post-secondary education, and we should continue it even to the idea of continuing education throughout the whole life of a person.

I would suggest that this statement of the minister's indicates this lack of co-operation and co-ordination. It shifts to the other authority, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, the responsibility for determining certain subjects that must be selected by the student. I suggest that that is an opting-out of the whole problem, and somehow we have to find a workable way in which we can prepare our students for whatever post-secondary education they may be having and genuinely give them the options that we say we are giving them.

I was pleased by the minister's statement on page 21 when he said:

> We have found that students, because they now take an active part in decisions affecting them, are shifting from passive to active learning. In those schools where this new approach has been adopted enthusiastically by the principal and teachers, discipline problems have been reduced considerably, and the reason seems to be that students are much more serious about their courses when they have actually had a hand in choosing them.

I sincerely hope that is true. I sincerely want to believe that is what happens, and I tend to think that does happen. But we have to emphasize that approach even more strongly, and during the course of the discussion I would like, if it is possible, the minister to table the statistics, the evidence and the examples that led him to that general statement.

I bring up this matter of statistics because the statistics that were used on page 22 were very dramatic, very encouraging. George Bernard Shaw once said, "Statistics can be used to prove anything." That is true; they

can be used to prove anything, including the truth.

But I would feel more comfortable about the statistics that the minister uses if they had been perhaps a little less selective and if there were control statistics given with them. For example, the minister says: "The number of students taking English at grade 13 levels jumped by 25.5 per cent."

What I would like, so that we get a genuine idea here of what is happening, is what was the increase in the total enrolment in grade 13? Was the level of interest in English at the grade 13 level because a large number of people had not taken it the previous year? Was there a corresponding drop in taking other languages? And how many more students were taking grade 13 in total?

In other words, I would like to determine, as far as possible, precisely why this figure has jumped so dramatically. If it indicates a genuine interest in English, then I say fine, great. But I really would like those control statistics so that we can find out what the figures actually mean.

On page 23, the minister talks about special education and, again, I quote directly:

> Before concluding, may I make note of the fact that the high standard of special education services developed in this province is being maintained within the financial resources now available to the school board.

I would like to point out that there is a nice little left hook in the end of that statement, slipped into the last part of the sentence. I would like to repeat the last part of that sentence, "within the financial resources now available to the school boards." When we look at the specific figures in the budget, if I am not mistaken the figure of grants that are available to special education runs to a relatively small amount of something around $300,000. That may be erroneous because there is another total vote of special education for the blind and the people in the Ontario hospitals. That is something that I really would like to examine solidly and concretely.

I would like to examine how the services in special education are being extended and to what groups of people. I know a number of people working within the special education sector of our system and I am very conscious of their devotion to the task; but I am really not convinced at this stage that the ministry is helping them as much as they could. So once again, I would like to take a look at that in some detail and I want some specific information that is the foundation, once again, of the minister's general statement.

As I said earlier, I didn't want to be unduly negative in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I really want genuinely to congratulate the ministry on the statement that begins at the bottom of page 23 and continues over on page 24:

> The minister said new regulations come into effect next September making retarded children eligible to apply for full-time school attendance at the same age as any other child with the right to attend until the age of 21. These changes will firmly establish that the school law governing the basic rights of attendance applies to all children.

My sincere and heartiest congratulations to you and your department, Mr. Minister. That is a change that we in the party support so wholeheartedly and without reservation. In fact, whatever can be done within the school system to aid this kind of pupil we would be more than willing to support you on. I think it is fitting that we give credit where credit is due in this matter. It is a humane and forward looking step.

But, in case you think that I am getting too kindly, that seems to me to have exhausted the minister, that one very positive action, because I can hardly bear to reread the last two pages of his statement. It was really quite anguishing, Mr. Chairman, to go through the doublethink that occurs in those last two pages.

Before I conclude these opening remarks, I would like to emphasize some basic principles which we in this party feel should be strongly pursued in the education field.

1. We feel that a thorough examination of whether or not compulsory attendance is a benefit at the elementary and secondary levels should be conducted.

2. We feel there is need for the re-establishment of an active role for community decision-making in the educational process, in other words, an active pursuit of the true community school.

3. We believe there should be the elimination of property taxation as the base for educational revenues at the earliest possible date. Immediate relief should be provided from property taxation for those on fixed incomes.

4. Active pursuit of true accessibility to all levels of education, especially for the lower

social and economic groups by redirecting educational spending so that the emphasis is placed at the elementary and pre-school level.

5. Open the schools to the total community. Make your total community the resource centre for the schools. Make education a life-long experience rather than a terminal one for everyone.

6. A very real development of special education, not merely for the gifted but also for the disadvantaged. Grants to encourage teachers to enter this specialized field.

7. An active working toward the elimination of the present middle class biases in curricula and in discipline in the school system.

8. Redress the long standing regional inequalities that have plagued the children in the educational system in regions such as northern and eastern Ontario with regard to the cultural and scientific aspects of life.

To this end the Department of Education, in active co-operation with the Department of Colleges and Universities, should promote:

(a) the continuous travelling of exhibits from such institutions as the Ontario Science Centre, the Royal Ontario Museum, the Art Gallery of Ontario, etc., which currently serve almost exclusively the Toronto-centred region;

(b) the increased activity of performing groups such as the Toronto Symphony Orchestra and Theatre Hour Company throughout the whole province;

(c) promote the interchange of art and cultural groups amongst the very many varied regions of the province, not only for the benefit of the school-aged children, but also for the whole community.

There are many other topics that we in this party wish to discuss in dealing in detail before these estimates are through, Mr. Chairman. I just want to enumerate a few of them.

At the appropriate time we would like to discuss the severance of the youth and recreation branch from your department, and we would like to discuss the remaining community schools aspect of that branch that remains within the Department of Education.

We want to discuss the use of facilities and some of the preliminary work of the select committee on that subject.

We want to discuss curriculum, particularly the one that you mentioned the other day, people in politics.

We want to discuss the teaching of labour history in the schools. We want to discuss teachers and how they are appointed to curriculum committees. We want to discuss the teachers' superannuation fund.

We want to discuss the handicap system employed in certain European countries and in parts of the United States, so that people from the lower social-economic classes get a genuine break in accessibility to education.

We want to discuss the whole question of teaching prejudice, and how this affects the curriculum and discipline within our schools.

We want to discuss the use of Italian or any other language, as well as English and French, as a language of instruction and as a teaching technique in our schools.

We want to discuss the present type of streaming, which very often works unfairly against those who are immigrants or those from the lower social and economic classes.

We want to discuss alternatives to the present schooling patterns. We want to take a look at how we can combine work and learning experience. We can combine schooling and education.

We want to discuss why industry doesn't pick up more of the share, more of the tab, for technical and commercial education costs that, as training, benefits them directly.

We want to discuss the closing of small schools that are relatively new, in places like Lennox and Addington, Cobourg, Sibley and so on.

Above all, we want to discuss flexibility in the school system, and the school leaving age.

I do not want you to think that I do not understand your predicament, Mr. Minister. After all, this is the first time you have piloted these particular estimates through the House. This is the first time that I have led off for our party on these estimates. You will find us, in this party, kindly, benevolent, understanding. We will praise you where that is deserved. But I want to serve notice here and now, we in this party are committed to giving this province the best possible education system. And we intend to delve into these most crucial expenditures in a searching and exhaustive way, item by item, detail by detail.

We are not going to be deterred by superficial answers. We want to discuss in a meaningful and dynamic way the biases, the direction and the meaning of education in Ontario, as well as the money.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to know that, in the days ahead when we are discussing his estimates, we will have many disagreements. We will have some areas of

agreement. Let us approach the task that we are starting today in a spirit of friendly adversity, a spirit in which the criticism which we make is sincerely meant and the suggestions that we make are positive ones.

We do not intend to be negative but we do intend to be very detailed, very exhaustive and very, very searching. This will not be an easy passage of expenditures for you. But when we are through it is my hope that we all feel we have brought an important service to the people of the province and to the educational system of the province. Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, perhaps before we get into the votes, I could respond to a few of these remarks perhaps in the spirit that my friend has ended with.

Mr. Lawlor: You look flabbergasted at the courtesy, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I am not really. I usually—

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): You are always so kind.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —expect courtesy from people! As a matter of fact when I listened to some of the things he was saying, I realized of course that I could say some of those things myself. It has been the aim of this government certainly over the last 20 years to provide this province with the best educational system possible, and I think we have done that in a comparison with any other jurisdiction on the North American continent. We look at the kind of system that has been built here and as my predecessor, the present Prime Minister, has said many times, if we compare it, it compares favourably. It ranks among the best.

Mr. Stokes: And some of the suggestions and innovations came from this side too.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Now this, of course, is not to say that everything is perfect; and of course it isn't. I certainly welcome the opportunity to discuss the various matters that my friend has just indicated he would like to discuss during these estimates. I told the House Leader we would probably be a couple of weeks, but I think now we may last until the end of June. But I am sure the House will bear with us.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): We will run out of time long before that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: And we will be glad to have you all share in our dialogue about education in this province.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): We will be very disciplined.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I, perhaps, am at a bit of a disadvantage, not having been a teacher myself. I am not sure whether my friend is an English teacher or not, but he is able to pull out some very appropriate quotations which are very apropos for the remarks that he made. I notice he also gave some suggestions of literature and poems that could be included—I think he said to newly-married couples. I don't know whether he wanted them included in the curriculum or not, I think—

Mr. Foulds: That was just a fringe benefit.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, well, I thought that there was one other little poem that should be included. Perhaps we should put it in one of our curriculum guidelines. It goes something like this:

Keep on growing the way you've been going,
Keep on growing the way you've been going,
You have been going and Davis will make it go,
Go, Ontario, go.

Mr. Foulds: That's not poetry; it's doggerel.

Hon. Mr. Wells: And as a matter of fact, there is another verse that says:

Davis will make it grow,
Come on, Ontario, Davis will make it go.

And we can even supply the music.

Mr. Stokes: I don't call that poetry.

Mr. Foulds: You don't have a French version, do you?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We can supply a French version to that. We can supply the music, and all the bands and choruses across the province, and put it along with—

Mr. Lawlor: I hope that isn't a reflection of the educational system.

Mr. Stokes: It won't make the text books.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They can sing it right after they finish: "A place to stand and a place to grow."

Mr. Lawlor: In those circumstances, Longfellow sounded good.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Minister, is that blank verse really—?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, it is passable. In my book it is passable when it is sung with a guitar.

Mr. Gaunt: Dalton Camp—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I appreciate very much the support of the critic for the New Democratic Party, and his comments about our distribution of circulars 14 and 15. I might say that I just sent off a letter to the Globe and Mail today, trying to explain why we sent these to every teacher in this province. It still doesn't seem to sink through to people that there was a real purpose in this.

I know the question will be asked: the unit cost was 56 cents a teacher, to send those to every teacher. But we feel that the benefit is strengthening and endorsing Canadianism. And when the Prime Minister says that we are to try to make use in our schools of Canadian textbooks, written by Canadians, and I say it, and my friend the former Minister of Education says it, or anybody says it, we mean it.

I don't know whether you have done any surveys on these lists or not, but apart from circular 15 being a listing of all the Canadian curriculum materials that are available, in Circular 14, 90 per cent of the textbooks are Canadian textbooks. I can tell you that if we don't have the kind of legislation that I have asked for—the updated legislation which is going through this House now which gives some authority to that Circular 14—we will see the Canadian textbook field, and the people who write Canadian textbooks, and the use of Canadian textbooks, eroded. This is the one tool that we have—to put Canadian textbooks on the authorized list and then to say that these have to be used. The books have to be picked from here.

I am very saddened to think that there are teachers in this provinces who would rather use American textbooks than those Canadian textbooks that are on our list. I think if we really mean what we say about believing that Canadian textbooks written by Canadians should be used, then we have got to have a vehicle like circular 14 and we have got to have every teacher knowing about it. We are not going to mail it every year to teachers, but this year, particularly, we felt that this was important.

Mr. B. Newman: Why not every year?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Every year it will be available in limited quantities, and each time we want to emphasize it we will send it out.

Mr. B. Newman: If it is as valuable as the minister says then it would be more valuable to send it out every year.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Believe me, it is valuable.

I just want to say a few words before we get into the actual detail of the votes. Most of the points that have been raised, of course, will be covered as we get into the votes because they are very specific things. There has been a lot of comment in the two speeches that were made, particularly the last one about our objectives in public education.

I just want to say a bit about this and to indicate the clear direction in which, I certainly feel, we are going. I don't think that anyone would dispute this statement, or would not acknowledge that there have certainly been a long series of major changes in Ontario education. I might say that a change in means doesn't necessarily mean a change in purpose.

I think that, over these past years, we have readily adopted changed means for the sake of improvement, for greater equality of opportunity and to accommodate changing social conditions. But we have not altered our purpose, and only an uninformed and superficial view of recent changes, I think, would suggest that we have altered our purpose.

Our purposes in the educational system of this province have always been very clear and very firm. We believed in equality of educational opportunity for people across this province whether they lived in a major wealthy city or whether they lived in a remote rural area. That is one of the aims and purposes of our educational system.

We have always felt that education was a lifelong process. We've never believed that education was something that ended when you reached 18 or 19 or 20 or 25. The developing or the nurturing of this kind of feeling and this kind of spirit in a young person is one of the basic aims and purposes of any educational system. We have always believed, in this province, that there should be full community use of our schools and this has been one of the aims of our ministry.

I was doing some reading the other day, and one of the descriptions of the purpose of public education was defined as that of helping young people become privately happy and publicly useful. I think this is, perhaps, a very good definition of the kind of education system that we believe in.

I think that to be privately happy implies a full measure of self-realization. To do this, a person must discover and develop his own interests and his own aspirations. He must develop a sense of both self-direction and self-discipline. He must value both independence and responsibility and these are the kind of things, I think, our school system must develop. To achieve these kinds of goals, he has to learn how to learn by mastering the skills on which learning depends.

If these goals are met, Mr. Chairman, I think that our students, as well as being privately happy, will be publicly useful. The ability to learn, the sense of responsibility and self-discipline which leads to individual goals, collectively, I think, leads to public goals. This is provided, of course, that our students have learned how to work co-operatively together, and through practice have learned how to conduct their own affairs with their fellow students in a tolerant, democratic, humane and morally responsible manner.

We have never lost sight of this kind of objective in our educational system, least of all now, and we don't intend to lose sight of it in the years to come. Now as my friends opposite know, conventional wisdom once divided education into a series of grades, each with different content and each one having to be mastered before you could pass on to the next. But, more and more, we see that the context of education is not this. The context of education should be a continuum—as my friend mentioned a minute ago. It should be a continuum, with each student moving at his own rate, depending on his ability, his own interests and perhaps the motivation and the expectation of people like his parents, and his teachers, and others—the kind of things that they help to establish within him.

Now, I don't think there is any argument about which framework is more likely to favour the self-realization and the self-development of each individual student. Teaching, as we all know, was once seen as transmitting facts from a stern adult to a neat row of docile little children. Today, we leave much of the transmission of facts to the textbooks and to the media.

The ideal teacher, today, is someone working with students, showing them how to tackle a problem co-operatively, helping them to find out the answers, and helping them to use the kind of information they have at hand. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this House — which method is more likely to produce the publicly useful citizen? To me certainly, the answer is self-evident.

In many schools today, a pupil's grades depend largely on his daily work, how he gathers up and analyzes information and arrives at conclusions. Many schools have dropped the system of promotion based on two or three formal exams, at one particular time in the year, when success depended to a great degree on his rapid recall and his memory. These schools that have replaced this system have not lost sight of the real objectives of education, I think they are moving closer to them.

Mr. Chairman, our objective in this ministry, and my objective as Minister of Education in this province, is to make the school system an agent for socially responsible self-realization. The changes that we have been promoting here are all designed, in one way or another, to help schools to become better able to deal with the individual as an individual, whatever his needs, whatever his mental ability or his physical disabilities. Mr. Chairman, we have held this objective, I feel, consistently, and we've made changes only to move closer to it. Any changes that we can make, and any discussions that we can have during these estimates to move closer to this objective, I would certainly welcome.

Perhaps, more important, I think there is strong evidence, also, that this objective is supported by a majority of our citizens. Now, my friend asked if we had the guts to ask people about our educational system. As he knows, we did. We went out and we asked parents what they thought of the system. We intend to go out, in the very near future, and ask students what they think of the system. We intend to ask teachers what they think. We intend to try and get out in the field and ask people, in an unbiased way, what they think. I am sure he has seen the report. I am sure my friends in the opposition have seen the report that we commissioned, and the tabulation of the results.

Mr. Foulds: Specifically about the impact of the ceilings on the quality of education.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, but what I am talking about now is the direction and purpose of

education and what parents expect. In this report, the largest number of parents said they thought that, above all, schools should foster the values of self-direction and independence, and should produce students who are able to think on their own.

They also felt that schools should stress learning skills, foster good citizenship, self-discipline, responsibility, and social skills. More than 80 per cent indicated one of these kinds of qualities as being what they thought was one of the most important things that our school system should teach. I think that the survey, to me, reveals very clearly that parents, in this province today, have an enlightened view of what constitutes quality education. I can tell the hon. members that the objective of this ministry is entirely in line with that view.

Mr. Lawlor: You are aware of how far you fall short.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am not saying everything is perfect. I am just saying that this is what parents feel about the system. Now, we also—and I think this is highly significant, and I know that my friends will disagree with this—but we also—

Mr. Lawlor: That's right, that is how I feel too. You don't produce competitive independent—

Hon. Mr. Wells: We also ask the parents—

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, it being 6 of the clock the chairman will now leave the chair until 8 of the clock.

Mr. Lawlor: Get the minister off the hook, eh?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): What hook?

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Purchase of coaches for GO Transit, statement by Mr. Carton 2963

Government plane accident, statement by Mr. Bernier 2963

Forest fire situation, statement by Mr. Bernier 2964

Death of HRH Duke of Windsor, statement by Mr. Davis 2964

Unavailability of women jurors, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer 2965

Litter regulations, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 2965

Statement by president of York University, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. R. F. Nixon 2966

Status of women in post-secondary education, questions of Mr. Kerr and Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 2967

LCBO jobs for women, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Lewis 2969

Ontario Club membership, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Cassidy Mr. Renwick 2969

Study of performance loan programme, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 2970

Weekend parking for public at Department of Labour lots, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Givens 2970

Request for meeting with Treasurer, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Sargent 2971

Hamilton harbour landfill, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Deans 2972

Kenora-Rainy River transportation study, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Reid, Mr. Stokes 2972

Purchase of coaches for GO Transit, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Deacon 2973

Egg industry, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Eaton 2973

Cancellation of car salesman's registration, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Shulman 2974

Water supplies to cities from rural areas, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Good 2974

Comments by president of Canadian Driver Pool, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Bounsall 2975

Department of Agriculture's contribution to CNE, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Reid 2975

Action Canada leader's comments on subversion, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. R. F. Nixon 2975

Income Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 2977

Securities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 2977

Collective Bargaining for Crown Employees, bill to provide for, reported 2978

Third reading 2994

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, continued 2994

Recess, 6 o'clock 3003

No. 76

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: Order please! When we rose at 6 o'clock the minister was in the midst of a statement and he may continue.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I think that the thing that I hadn't concluded saying was that parents had indicated what they thought were the ideals of quality education, and some of the things that parents thought our school system should be doing.

I appreciate the spirit with which my new friends have approached this debate, and I know that they don't particularly feel that this next statement that I am going to make is appropriate, but I certainly feel that it is. I think that if you do a survey you are certainly entitled to at least indicate what the results were.

We were very pleased to find that 65 per cent of those surveyed considered existing educational services to be good or excellent. This indicated that the parents who had responded in this survey felt this about the educational service that they were getting in this province. Only 7 per cent felt that the education that their children were receiving was poor.

I think that in a province that is as large and diverse as ours is this is a considerable achievement. I think that it indicates the kind of financing that we have carried on in past years has certainly paid dividends. It has been necessary, it has been successful and it has built an educational system of considerable excellence.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): How many were in this survey?

Hon. Mr. Wells: A thousand.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: With a province as diverse as this? Seven million people?

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friend the Leader of the Opposition, knows that the Gallup Poll doesn't use much more than that to sample opinion across Canada and—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): And we don't like it either.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As my other friend says it depends what the results are. On some things you like it and some things you don't.

We feel that this was a very interesting and a very worthwhile survey. People have said: "Why don't you ask people what they think about your educational system?" We did, and I think one of the interesting things in this survey was the eagerness with which they responded—in the way they even amplified the questions by adding written comments and written pages with their returns.

I would just like to say a few words—and I say this with respect—about the comments made by the two Opposition critics. If I could find a thread running through their remarks at certain times, it was something like "more is better." In other words if you can spend more money, you'll have a better system.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh no; you misconstrued that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well that certainly came out. I thought that perhaps—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: More money could make it better.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —that perhaps this was just my own interpretation of it. I asked several other unbiased people around here who had been listening to this and—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Anybody we know?

Mr. Deans: Like the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman), the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko)—

Hon. Mr. Wells: —and they all said that they sort of saw this same thread running through—"more is better."

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You should have more confidence in your own opinion.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that it is interesting to take a look at just what has been happening, insofar as costs of education in this province are concerned.

The total cost of elementary and secondary education between 1967 and 1968 rose by about 20 per cent; between 1968 and 1969 it rose 15.7 per cent; between 1969 and 1970, 12.2 per cent; 1970 to 1971, 9.7 per cent, and 1971 to 1972, we think about nine per cent.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Is that for operating or the total cost?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, this is basically the total cost of running the elementary and secondary school system.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is away back—it is only $2 billion.

Hon. Mr. Wells: These are the kind of percentage increases that were there three or four years ago and which we find now. And you contrast this with the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Health; contrast it with health!

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I am going to contrast it with the kind of support that we are now paying.

Although the total cost of education was going up 20 per cent, and then 15 per cent in 1970-1971, we raised our support from 47.9 per cent to 51.5. That is the part that the province pays. Then in 1971-1972 it was further increased to 55.6 per cent. Now we have added $47 million more in these estimates—that is $47 million beyond what would normally be required to keep it level with the percentage that we paid last year to raise it to somewhere between 58 and 60 per cent this year.

In other words, when you look back four or five years, you see that the escalation of total cost of the elementary and secondary system in this province each year is being pulled back. At the same time the provincial support has been increasing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You took community colleges out of it, but that was a small item.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, this is not budget. This is the total cost of the elementary and secondary school system. I am not talking about the budget of our department. This is the philosophy behind our ceilings.

It is what I said in my opening statement and it's a reflection of the words of the Economic Council of Canada about two years ago when they warned all governments in this country that they should be very much aware of the costs of education and health services. These costs were escalating at such a rapid rate that by the year 2000 they would be using up the whole of the gross national product. They said we should be aware of this.

At the same time they told us that we should, of course, be aware of the great dividends to be reaped from a good educational system and that cost limitations shouldn't hamper that system. This is what we have tried to do. We have tried to take this warning. We have tried to bring down the escalation in costs while, as you can see, there is still a percentage increase in the total cost of the system. We have tried to keep it within limits without sacrificing the quality.

Mr. Gaunt: You have tried to strike a balance.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that this has been done; it is very interesting.

I have heard in the two statements the fact that this course and that course were perhaps being cut out. We can talk about that more when we get into the details but instead of saying what courses have been cut out, perhaps we should look at what courses are now in the system. It is fantastic, I think.

I received this the other day and I didn't see anything like this when I went to secondary school. This is the calendar for Western Technical Commercial School in Toronto; it is thicker, I think, than the university calendar was when I went to university. The multitude of courses that are offered there this year, within the ceiling limits that the Toronto board has, is fantastic.

I would recommend it to the hon. members to see just how they handle the credit system. This whole calendar, I think, is an ideal thing. It is, unfortunately, the only one that I have had the chance to survey in the last couple of weeks, but I think that they have accepted the spirit of our credit system. They have adapted it. They have done some of the kind of things that the hon. member mentioned.

They have put in there tables of what your ultimate goal is and, if it is there, what kind of courses you should take. In other

words, the choice is the student's but they have given him guidance here which I think is the whole thing that we are trying to get at in this new system.

We are not saying that everybody should just stand back and let the student pick as he would with a pin or something and say, "I think I'll take this, this and this." There will be all kinds of guidance and co-operation from people but the student has to assume responsibility. He is not handed a timetable and told: "This is what you'll take, and there it is."

I think that schools like this are, within the financial limitations, developing within the spirit of our new HS1 programme. I think that is the key to this whole thing.

I just hope, and I think that during the estimates we'll probably ferret this out, that the feeling of the opposition is not that more is better. I think we have to accept in this day and age that there have to be some limits on the amount of increase in spending on education.

That is certainly our philosophy here. I think that perhaps it is yours but if it isn't I hope you'll say so in the estimates because if you don't believe in any kind of ceiling on education. I think the members of this House and the people of this province are entitled to know that.

Now with those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I think we can get on to the detailed analysis of the various votes, I'll deal with a lot of the other things that were raised as we go through the votes.

Mr. Chairman: We will call vote 2201.

On vote 2201:

Mr. Chairman: I am just wondering—quite a few of these items could be discussed together. For instance, the first three could be lumped together and probably one or two toward the end could be separate, that's item by item. Would that be reasonable to approach it that way?

Mr. Foulds: Reasonable from our point of view.

Mr. Chairman: Let's try the first three items then as a group. Is there any discussion on them?

Mr. Foulds: Before we start, I wonder if I could ask for information, Mr. Chairman, of either you or the minister. There are a couple of topics and I'm not sure what vote they would fall under; I'd like some guidance. Under what vote would we discuss the Symons report on French language education? Would that be on this first vote or under curriculum development?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. minister—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I would say we would discuss that under the second vote, formal education K to 13.

Mr. Foulds: Vote 2202?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, vote 2202.

Mr. Foulds: Fine, any special item there, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It basically covers the whole programme because it is the French language school system which is a companion school system. I think you could talk about it anywhere there.

Mr. Foulds: Fine! And community schools; community use of schools and the severance of the youth and recreation branch and the remaining community school thing that you have with them within your department?

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have a comment?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, we could discuss that in 2202 also.

Mr. Foulds: Vote 2202; fine!

Hon. Mr. Wells: As the hon. member realizes, the remaining parts of that operation that are left in our department are to a great degree attached to curriculum services and curriculum and regional offices, and so forth.

Mr. Foulds: Fine, thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville on 2201.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, before we get into specific comments, may I ask the minister what the figure was concerning the percentage of grants given to municipalities for the year 1968?

Hon. Mr. Wells: For the year?

Mr. B. Newman: For 1968.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The percentage of grant given to—

Mr. B. Newman: The total cost of educaiton; what percentage of it was absorbed by the province for the year 1968?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It was 47.9.

Mr. B. Newman: It was 47.9 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. B. Newman: Naturally, if the minister uses the figures that he has there, there is going to be some discrepancy in our calculations, because I happen to have one that apparently comes from the Department of Education reports to the minister, stating that in 1968 the grants as a percentage of school board expenditures were 44.2.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I will be glad to check that, Mr. Chairman. The figures that I was quoting, and I didn't bother to go back and check the reports of ministers who were here before I was, are taken from page 13 of the Treasurer's statement this year.

Mr. B. Newman: It just leaves one wondering which of the figures now are the correct figures so that when the minister mentions that 58 to 60 per cent of the total cost of education—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am sorry; I think perhaps I have given you the wrong figure. The figure I think that you've stated is right. The figure of 47.9 per cent was for the year 1968-1969, and the figure that you are quoting is probably for 1967-1968.

Mr. B. Newman: I would assume that the figure that I am reading is for the corresponding year. I'm using the report put out by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, Financing Public Education in Ontario, 1970, page 21.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As I indicated, the 44.16 is the figure for the year 1968. The ministers' reports are put out on a January to December basis. They are put out for a year. The percentage of the budget figures which I gave you are based on the amount that is in the Treasurer's budget, which is for a year that goes over to March 31 of the next year. It doesn't correspond with the school year that begins in September either.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under all circumstances, when we do discuss figures, we are going to be comparing apples with oranges anyway, because we are going to give you one set of figures, you are going to give us a different set of figures and which apply no one is really going to know.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh yes we will.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That is right; sock it to him!

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that we are far off. I have now a copy of the page that I think the member may be looking at. They list the figure for 1968 as 44.16, and that is basically the same as the figure that I indicated.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the minister at this time about department policy. I am asking under the first vote, primarily, because I would like to get a few of these questions cleaned up, so we don't have to ask them later on.

What is the department's policy concerning the school leaving age? Not too long ago we debated in the House the idea of lowering the school leaving age for individuals who are not gaining anything by their attendance at school but simply keeping dust off seats, and who are not accomplishing a thing and really being a deterrent to the whole system, but are forced to remain in school. All parties agreed on the principle of an earlier leaving age, is the department considering changes in the present legislation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, basically, it is not so many years since we changed the legislation to make 16 the school leaving age with no ifs, ands or buts in it. I don't think that we are going to just simply and easily change that now. We are not going to accept the stance that says kids under that age can automatically just be thrown out of school with no other attempt to create any alternative, to think of any other method that could be beneficial to them just because somebody happens to think that they don't belong in that school. And those people may or may not be right.

I have had some chats with the headmasters association about this. I have said that we are willing to look at reasonable alternatives to this, and they have indicated they would like to consider this and perhaps present some reasonable alternative. We are always willing to look at anything that is progress, but I don't think that to automatically now just say: "Let's change the age back to 14 or something," with consideration of no alternatives, is a really viable action. And we are not willing to do that.

But if somebody can present some reasonable alternatives—we are putting our emphasis in the direction of looking at alternatives within the system for that student; because perhaps it is to his advantage to stay in there

if the school system can adapt and get something meaningful for him. I think my friend mentioned alternatives to formal schooling. We have got an experiment going that I hope will be starting in Peterborough soon, that will be looking at this. We have, you know, various things like this that I think we have to look at.

I think, if the hon. member will recall, the Hall-Dennis report left the implication that we should raise the age above 16. Now, we are not considering that, but I think that implication was in the Hall-Dennis report.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, no one is suggesting that you don't have alternatives. In fact the minister, with the introduction of new types of courses, does have an alternative. The individual does have the alternative to return to school at any time he so wishes, providing he is within the age that he can come back into a classroom. So you are really not completely isolating the individual, putting him into a labour market when he is not accomplishing anything in school. There is the alternative, Mr. Minister.

I was simply wondering whether the department, at this stage, is willing to see eye to eye with all sides of the House when they debated the issue; and thought that the school leaving age should have been reduced on condition that the individual can return to the school system at any time he so wishes in the future? Does the minister not consider that an alternative?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is just one alternative, and that isn't really what I would call a really viable alternative. Certainly that avenue should be opened for anyone to return to school whether they are under 16, or over 16, and move into the system. But I am thinking more of the kind of alternative that says perhaps this student needs something different from the regular—what would you say, 9 to 3.30 in the school setting? Or some alternative to this. And this is the kind of thing that we are only beginning to scratch the surface of. And that's the kind of alternative I would like to see people put their emphasis on, before we just automatically say let's lower it, so anybody can throw anyone out below 16 if they wish. I am thinking here of a case where people are basically—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Only the consent of the principal or the chairman of the board.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Some of them may feel that somebody is a burden, or is holding back the class. Now I recognize there are people of certain religious beliefs and so forth who believe that the school age should be lower and we recognize these—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right!

Hon. Mr. Wells: But we still think that it is probably to the detriment of that young person that they don't have a chance to have the equal opportunity of education that all their fellow students are having. And perhaps we have a responsibility to encourage them to stay in school longer.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, is the minister considering then raising the school leaving age to the age of majority?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I indicated, Mr. Chairman, a minute ago, we are not considering raising the school leaving age.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is just perfect the way it is?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, nothing is perfect.

Mr. B. Newman: Then has the minister's department not studied the various ages at which a student should be allowed to leave school and come down with some type of policy concerning the leaving age? Is the whole idea of students leaving school simply in limbo? Surely over the years that we have discussed it—I have been in the House now for a few years and there are at least 10 years that we have discussed this issue—the department should have come through with some type of policy.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The hon. member talks as if this was something that had been in here since antiquity. My predecessor only changed the Act to make it 16 positively about four or five years ago.

But as I have indicated to the hon. member I have asked the headmasters and others to look at alternatives. When people bring forward some viable alternatives we are very open to look at any change that will benefit the students. This we will do.

Mr. B. Newman: I will leave this topic and turn it over to the—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur wishes to discuss this?

Mr. Foulds: Yes. I remember very vividly that private members' hour in which this issue was discussed. I was the sixth speaker up and didn't get an opportunity to speak on

it. What I would have said follows along these lines.

First of all I would have disagreed with the previous speaker.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Can't let a good speech go to waste.

Mr. Foulds: Well as a matter of fact I ripped it up because I didn't think I would get the opportunity again. I thank my friend, the critic of the Liberal Party, for raising the whole issue.

I would have disagreed for almost precisely the same reasons that my colleague from Windsor West (Mr. Bounsall) marginally agreed with that bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He agreed. He considered it a viable alternative.

Mr. Foulds: There is a very real danger that we sometimes forget in this day and age of lowering the school age again automatically to 14. I think the danger is that children can, even under the conditions of that bill, be unfairly and unduly exploited. All the pressure of their parental background, their social-economic background, some of the alienation that they feel from the school system, would turn them off the school system. So they would get the recommendation of the principal that the child has not been a good student. It might be the last time the minister and I agree in these estimates, but I think we need to look at positive alternatives that involve a combination of work and learning experience.

In experiments that are now going on in Britain and, in fact, right here in Toronto, there is a mix of the students working a day in their school week. I would like to see that increased. Let the students work four days of the week. But for goodness sake let's open up the system so we can keep a tie with the system for the student.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The job would be part of his training.

Mr. Foulds: Certainly! But let's not think in these rigid categories where because for some reason or another the student may be a problem. As a teacher I sympathize with the problem. We do get students that we say —because we don't have the time to look at them fully and humanely and with some understanding—the kid is not a good learner. He would be better off outside the school system. That may be true in the present system but surely what we are working toward here is modifying that system—making the system less rigid, and therefore making it more adaptable for the individual student.

Surely we are also trying to say that the student should learn at his own pace. So the question that you are going to raise the school-leaving age to 21, I think, is a reductio ad absurdum. Those of you that aren't Latin scholars should take that classics course I was talking about previously.

Mr. Sargent: I was there last week.

Mr. Foulds: It hasn't done you any good yet.

Mr. Gaunt: That is a reduction ad absurdum.

Mr. Foulds: That is right. I think that with the student who comes—I know in my own area—from a farming background, where the farms are marginal, it is not for religious reasons, which are sometimes understandable and viable that the parents put the pressure on the student to leave.

I think that it is absolutely a backward step to say to that student: "We as a society, and we as a school system, have no responsibility to encourage you to maintain your education."

So I would like to put on record here, a very strong disagreement with the previous speaker, because I don't think that the automatic lowering of the age offers the genuine alternative that we are seeking. I think that we should be thinking more along the lines of a mix of experience, work and school system experience, and we should be mixing that with a genuine educational experience. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask of the minister if, under grants in aid of educational research, the department is taking into consideration some of the suggestions made by, I would assume any school board. I'm going to use the Welland Separate School Board's brief, and I bring to the attention of the minister some of the things that they suggest.

That is: Research should be carried out to determine what is the proper enrolment, from an economic standpoint, for an elementary school. Now, this, I would assume, could come under educational research.

Should it be a nine-room unit, 12-room unit? What facilities are necessary? All of this would have a fairly important bearing

on the quality of education, and likewise on the cost of education.

At what size is there a need for a gymnasium, for a library resource centre? When does the principal of an elementary school have need for a vice-principal? How much secretarial help is needed for every 100 pupils in the school? What is the proper teacher-pupil ratio for a kindergarten, primary division, junior division, intermediate division?

Some guidelines for school boards are needed in all of the various items that I have mentioned, Mr. Minister. And I would hope that the department would have undertaken some types of studies and be able to inform school boards about the various items of which I have made mention.

I would like the minister's reply to the few items that I have mentioned now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will recall, I announced in the House the other day, the awarding of the grants to aid research which were being given to either universities, or school boards, or OISE, to carry on research. Now, this was for projects which were suggested by these people themselves, and they wanted to get funded. The hon. member, I think, has a list. I passed out, at that time, a list of those—

Mr. B. Newman: Did the minister check over the list and see some of the exotic topics?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. B. Newman: None of the bread and butter issues at all.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I indicated at that time these were picked by a committee and they were all felt to have some relevance to the school system. They are intended that, when the research is done, the avenues of communication be opened so that it can get back into the system and not just be a research study sitting on a shelf collecting dust. It will have some relevance.

I realize that some of the things that the hon. member suggested may not be in there; and, for that reason, we've held back a part of the research money that we have. That money is going into what we call contractual research which will be decided upon by a committee in our department headed by Howard Gillies, and a group of people who will decide the areas of research that we will ask people to do.

This is as opposed to the kind of grants that we already gave, which were to support people who wanted to do research on their own.

And our committee felt there was good reason that they should do that.

We are now looking at the kinds of research that we should do. And I'm sure that some of the topics that the member has suggested will be the kind that are considered. I can't tell you. The committee is still meeting. They haven't made up their minds for this year. But the money that we are voting here, a lot of it will go for this kind of reason—

Mr. B. Newman: Bread and butter issues?

Hon. Mr. Wells: And, believe me, I have told them that they should be bread and butter issues. I suggested a few months ago that somebody should do a study native to Canada, on pupil-teacher ratio and some of these kind of issues. We intend that the contractual research will be on bread and butter issues, not very ethereal things that may not have a practical relation to what goes on in the classroom.

Mr. B. Newman: The various grants given by the minister for the studies that are included on the circular, or the sheet that we received from the department; I am not, under any stretch of the imagination, saying that they don't have some type of value. But they don't have the practical value today. School boards are more interested in the size of a classroom, the construction of a school, the number of students that one teacher should be responsible for. As I said earlier, Mr. Minister, and as you have repeated, the bread and butter. I think the department really should take care of that first, before it comes into some of the other avenues of research.

Now, may I ask the minister if there are any studies at present underway, in conjunction with his department, the Department of Health, the Department of Community and Social Services, or any one of the three, individually, to recognize early learning disabilities, so as to enlighten parents on the proper steps that they must take to assist their children, especially those who happen to have children with various types of learning disabilities?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member is aware of the research that is going on in Windsor, where

we are attempting to identify, in kindergarten, the abilities and the characteristics of kindergarten children, and then follow them through; find out what they are identifying at this very early age. If they have any disabilities, any handicaps that will hamper their progress in school, then they will be followed through. This identification programme is one research study that we are participating in.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, does the minister not think that even pre-schoolers are the ones that should be involved in the studies, so that actually before they attempt to get into a classroom their disabilities could have been diagnosed, and proper assessment made and followed up?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, there are of course many studies going—in not only our department but other areas—with the identification of children and what might be their learning handicaps and how these can better be assisted. I recall the Department of Social and Family Services is supporting a five-year programme to study children in nursery schools in Toronto and in Ottawa. This will have a direct effect on the learning and identification of problems that these children will exhibit.

There are certainly others going on. I think there is one very interesting thing, in this regard, that I have recently become interested in, and hope that we will be able to develop. It is a system where we would identify at birth, and have a registry at birth, of any handicaps that a doctor felt was exhibited at that time, so that all those who came in contact with that child would be aware that there had already been some assessment that might be useful in the progress of that child as he progresses on through various nursery school settings and educational settings. This is just an idea that someone threw out, not so long ago, and it may have merit, and it may not. But it is, again, along the avenue of early identification of children with problems.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the minister can readily accept the frustration of a parent who has a youngster enrolled, or about to be enrolled, in a school and then, all of a sudden, finds the youngster has a certain disability, a learning disability, a handicap. Where does the parent go? Were there some guidance or some direction or some individual to whom the parents could communicate in the municipality, then probably this problem could be resolved or minimized.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Welland South on this particular point.

Mr. Haggerty: On the same views that the member for Windsor-Walkerville has been discussing here, and this deals with the report from the Welland County Separate School Board prepared by Mr. Alec Kuska, superintendent, and I am sure the minister must have a copy of this report; he raises one important question dealing with educational television. In the section devoted to educational television, the brief points out that teachers and principals appear to be in favour of a policy that would put less emphasis on spending for educational television, and more on provincial funds for supplies, books and libraries, and teachers' aids I guess it is.

Why is the Ontario government on one hand, spending millions of dollars on educational television, and on the other hand the same government places ceilings on per-pupil expenditure, which means cutting the programme services, tightening the teacher-pupil ratio and providing fewer library books?

The brief goes on to say that the questionaires were given to the teachers and principals, they definitely would favour higher spending ceilings over expenditures for educational television.

And I have been following some of the comments made about schools, particularly in the Welland South riding. There was a newspaper article last year with a picture showing library rooms with no books; and the photo caption said there were no funds available to purchase library books. And I wonder with all the apparent vacant classrooms in the county schools, in the separate and the public school systems, why more money is not allocated for libraries and books that can be placed in these vacant classrooms?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course the answer to this question is that the boards themselves have to decide what they are going to spend on library books.

The grant system leaves a lot of these things up to the board; to their local, autonomous, elected board to decide where they will put their priorities in spending within the limits of the money that they are given.

If the hon. member is talking about how

much we spend on educational television in this budget of over one billion dollars, it is about $6.8-million. And I think we can justify that expenditure, and I think that what it produces is and will be beneficial for the students in our system.

That is what we spend as a department to support educational television. Now again, boards themselves may decide of their own free will to further support educational television; as they do in Metro Toronto and have done in Ottawa and other places. But they can make the decision themselves.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, it seems by this report that the school boards are pressured into getting into the field of educational television. It seems that they have very little say in this; this is the policy set down by the Department of Education and they must adhere to that policy.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we pressure any board to get into educational television.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on these first two items? The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Yes. In your department's budget, under what item does the educational television budget appear?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2202, curriculum development.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's under 2202; curriculum.

Mr. Foulds: Well, we'll wait for that one.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville, then; further on the first three items.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, I just wanted to ask of the minister a general question—

Mr. Chairman: Go ahead.

Mr. B. Newman: It concerns bargaining procedures of teachers and school boards.

In the city of Windsor, that is under district 1, a brief was submitted concerning the process of negotiations between teachers and school board; and in the brief they make mention that present legislation is inadequate when it comes to bargaining.

Is the department considering introduction of some type of legislation so that it would be a little more specific and teachers and boards could bargain and resolve their problems a little easier than what is taking place today?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well Mr. Chairman, I think, as the hon. member knows, we are in the process, or I am in the process, of waiting for the report of the commission that was asked to investigate the bargaining between teachers and school boards. They've given this, I understand, very exhaustive study; and that report—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is 18 months now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well that report, I am told, will be available to me in about two or three weeks. As soon as it's available, I'll be happy to table it in the House and then we can all have a look at it and have a good discussion on it. But I really think that, rather than prejudice the report—as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said they have worked on it for 18 months—we wouldn't want to prejudice what their opinions may be by discussing it at this time. But once it is out in the open, we'll then be able, I am sure, to have a good discussion on this topic. I am looking forward to seeing it, I am sure, just as much as the hon. member is, because I think that we want to see if we can develop a better system, if that is possible in this province, for negotiations between teachers and their school boards.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I thought I'd bring out to the minister the concern of the teachers in district 1 on this topic. The minister has given the reply, and we'll accept that and eagerly await the report of the committee.

The other topic that I wanted to discuss at this time, Mr. Chairman, is the idea of the numbers of women administrators in your own department. Does your department have at least a sizeable percentage of the staff—and I mean the professional staff, and not the clerical staff—of the gentler sex?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think in all honesty, Mr. Chairman, I would have to answer and say that I am not satisfied with the percentage that I find there now. Everyone that holds a top or middle administrative job in our department I think is a key qualified person. But I think probably only about 12 out of 100 perhaps or so of the top jobs—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would say about one out of 30 in the lineup you had here tonight.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well you see one of the key ones sitting out here on the floor tonight.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Somebody to keep the minister straight.

Hon. Mr. Wells: She also keeps the books straight. But I think that this is something that is faced by not just our department. I think school boards, society in general, is in that position now where the role of the woman in top management positions, middle management positions is an emerging role. And it is beginning to be accepted. I am sure the hon. member noticed that the Toronto School Board the other day just appointed three women to fairly key top administrative positions in their system. And I think we will see more of this, and certainly it is something we'll consider in the department. We'll certainly have no prejudice or discrimination against women. The minister certainly hasn't either.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'm glad to hear that.

Mr. B. Newman: I am glad to hear that the minister does not discriminate against the fairer sex. May I bring to his attention some of the statistics that were provided to me concerning ladies? Now there are only nine female principals in Ontario secondary schools. There are only 25 female vice-principals and there are only 1,007 female heads of departments. It certainly does indicate some type of discrimination. Whether it is intentional or otherwise will be left to an individual to judge himself. But I hope we can overcome that imbalance, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has been wanting the floor for quite some time.

Mr. Sargent: Are we still on the first vote?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, on the first three items.

Mr. Sargent: It's amazing how you get so many eggheads in the crowd here, like teachers. You can keep on talking aesthetics, but you can't talk the dollar bills. In the second vote, Mr. Minister, you are asking for $4,202,000 as against $2.8 million last year.

Mr. Haggerty: That's where that jet aircraft is going!

Mr. Sargent: What's the reason for it?

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): The wrong vote!

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Minister of Education has his own personal auditor.

Mr. Sargent: His own personal jet? That's right!

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Bring those eggheads into line.

An hon. member: External audit.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can tell the member the increases and decreases in this vote that bring about the net total increase of about $1.3 million. There are some internal transfers from other budgets to this vote. In other words, some internal transferring in our department.

Mr. Sargent: I suppose you don't know?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, I've got it all here. I am just going to explain it all to you. There is $291,600 for the departmental library, there is $25,000 to the research unit, there is $899,000 contractual research from OISE. This is money that has been taken back—that's been changed from another vote, that is used in this contractual research.

Mr. Sargent: I missed that. Say it again.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Contractual research from OISE, $899,000.

Mr. Sargent: Explain that. What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is money that is used for the kind of contractual research that I was just talking to your colleague about a few minutes ago.

Mr. B. Newman: Why wouldn't that be in the OISE vote?

Mr. Sargent: From OISE?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has been transferred from the OISE grant. It is part of that policy of taking the money back from OISE, putting it in our department, and having us decide who does the contractual research.

Mr. Sargent: Does anyone understand what that means? Does anyone understand that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, I think that most of us—

Mr. Foulds: Yes, I do, as a matter of fact.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —understands what it means. As the member will recall, it was an-

nounced, I think, about a year ago, that instead of giving all our—

Mr. Sargent: I don't speak Latin though.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —research money to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, and letting them do all the educational research in this province, we said we would establish a policy whereby, over the next three years, we took so much of the money off the OISE grant which was a straight transfer payment in these estimates, and we would take that money, not reducing the amount on research, but take it out of their vote, put it into a contractual research vote here. Then this committee, that I was talking to you about earlier, was going to decide who was going to do the contractual research. We would have a say in it then.

Before, the money went to OISE and they decided what research was done. In this way we can do what your colleague said. We can take some of the bread and butter issues and we can decide to do the contractual research. That is what that $899,000 is for.

Mr. Sargent: Who decides what to do though? Who decides that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, it's a committee that is headed by—I guess I decide in the end. But the committee recommends to me, and the minister approves it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, that is what I am concerned about, you see. This man who has held four or five portfolios here, who is the least equipped to run this department. We have guys like Mr. B. Newman or Mr. Foulds here who are guys who know what they are talking about.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member has lost a lot of friends. He can stop right now. Stop right now.

Mr. Sargent: This guy here is really inept in this business. He makes the decision to spend $2 million.

Mr. Ferrier: He is trying to get you a position in the cabinet.

Mr. Yakabuski: The member will regret it tomorrow.

Mr. Ferrier: He wants to get you into the cabinet.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to change the vote, I want to tell you. I want it registered for Hansard. My concern is about the way this guy can spend—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! I think the member should be speaking respectfully to the hon. minister.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, I'm sorry. The hon. minister will understand. Are you concerned with the wording, sir? The wording? Okay, they are very correct, sir.

This minister can increase from $2.8 million to $4.2 million in administration—$1.3 million in administration in his judgment. He can do these things. He can whack these things by his judgment. He knows nothing about this business. Why doesn't he tell us the truth—that his civil servants tell him what he is going to do. And the fact is that he is just a tool in the hands of the civil servants.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! We are discussing the estimates of this department.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, we will talk about the estimates, Mr. Chairman. I am concerned, as a taxpayer, about the fact that we don't have anything to say about this. I am concerned about the fact that a bunch of eggheads are running the show and that the taxpayer has nothing to say about this deal.

An hon. member: Why doesn't the member get off of this?

An hon. member: The member gets a chance to vote.

An hon. member: We'd be more comfortable if the eggheads of the department had—

Mr. Walker: The member is on the wrong vote.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to talk about this vote. We have a vote of $1.7 million for data processing. Do we own this service?

Mr. Chairman: We are not quite to that item yet. We are just on the first three items.

Mr. Sargent: What are you on? The first three?

Mr. Chairman: The first three items at the present time, yes.

Mr. Sargent: How do you decide what you are going to do?

Mr. Walker: Just education.

An hon. member: Has the member got the right page?

Mr. Sargent: Did you say the first three items?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: When did you say that?

Mr. Chairman: It was generally agreed at the beginning.

Mr. Sargent: As of now?

Mr. Chairman: No, no. It was agreed by all parties at the beginning.

Mr. Foulds: It was agreed.

Mr. Yakabuski: About an hour ago.

Mr. Sargent: I haven't missed a bit, I'll tell you. I haven't missed a thing.

Mr. Walker: The member is in the wrong committee.

Mr. Sargent: If I can't talk about data processing, I would like to talk about the general administration of the consolidation across the province. Is this included here in this increased amount of $1.3 million for school consolidation?

An hon. member: Try again.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member talking about the consolidation of school boards?

Mr. Sargent: Let me ask the minister. I'm not talking to you, Mr. Chairman, I am asking the minister.

Mr. Chairman: Well, the member is supposed to speak through the chairman.

Mr. Sargent: You're almost as bad as Mr. Reuter here. He doesn't know what is going on either.

Mr. Chairman: We try. I think the organization of the school systems would better come under 2203—or 2202?

Mr. Sargent: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask the minister a question concerning—

Mr. Yakabuski: Later, at 2 o'clock!

Mr. Haggerty: —a recent article in the Globe and Mail. It deals with the politics course which may include FLQ, Panthers, and so forth; and it said that the Department of Education issued guidelines for such a course for Ontario high school students. Could the minister inform me what guidelines are established?

Hon. Mr. Wells: With respect, Mr. Chairman, that is vote 2802, K to 13—the curriculum branch.

Mr. Haggerty: Isn't this minister's policy in this first vote? This is what I am trying to get at. I mean you must have some policy set now, some standards—

Mr. Chairman: Apparently what you are talking about comes out under item 1 of 2202. We will get to that very shortly.

The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

There are a number of items I would like to discuss. I wonder if the minister could for starters continue to list what he began—itemizing the general administration costs. I particularly would like him to point out the additional services that have been lumped under that, that account for the $1.3 million increase—where they come from and why they are in this vote.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think I finished it. Contractural research from OISE, $899,000; the cultural exchange unit, $353,000; these were all internal transfers. They may represent a slight increase in spending but very little.

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you tell them you don't know?

Hon. Mr. Wells: New funds for added functions: our research unit, $32,500. That's an increase, the administrative machinery to handle the contractual research and granting mechanism. Cultural exchange, $54,200.

I am sorry, that's the increase above what was in the first figure I gave you. That was the straight transfer and this is the increase. That includes a French teacher exchange programme, $20,000, in that cultural exchange increase of $54,200.

The education resources allocations system, $210,000. That's the task force that's been set up to work with school boards to encourage the adoption of programme budgeting by school boards. And there's $210,000 has been added for that.

Also $60,000 has been added in this vote for the council on French language schools, so that makes a total of $356,700.

I have given you them in round figures, because actually if you take the total there it is $356,700 in increased new funds. You add to that the $1,568,600 which was the internal transfers, and then the reductions that have been affected.

The contractual research grants-in-aid $370,000, a deduction in that. Seven positions have been deleted in this particular area of general administration, which is a reduction of $84,500. Then we made some net reductions of around $100,000, so that we had a total of about half a million—$553,800. We add all this up and get an increase of $1,371,500.

Mr. Foulds: I would just like to pursue this a bit. I think I get fairly clearly the picture that you are outlining here. But doesn't it continue to add up to an overall increase in centralized administration?

The task force on programme budgeting for local boards I think is once again the kind of thing that we would be looking at quite sympathetically. I wonder if it doesn't somehow contradict the rationalization that was used when we went into the regional school boards a couple of years ago. One of the arguments at that time was that the regionalization in the larger school board unit would cut the administrative cost at the central core. I think that by and large people of the province were encouraged to believe that the cuts would be more dramatic than they have been.

While I'm speaking on this topic, I wonder if that task force has been appointed, or are you just estimating for it now?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes; the director of the task force has been appointed. Mr. Lawless—Doug Lawless, the director of education of the Ottawa School Board—is leaving that position, and coming down on June 1, to be the director of that task force. Then the rest of the members will be appointed.

There'll be representatives of the public. There'll be representatives of the various professional groups. The whole idea is not to arbitrarily inflict this on school boards, but to be able to go around the province and work with school boards to show them the benefits of this, and to try and make their administrative and budgeting processes more—to streamline them and to try and make them more effective. Hopefully, they may be able to, through programme budgeting, set their objectives, and then see if they're meeting them. In the long run, we'll all save money out of it.

Mr. Foulds: I wonder if I could, once again, pursue that point. As I understand it the task force will not become functional, really, until after June 1. I would imagine the department is already considering the people who will be appointed, along with Mr. Lawless.

But the problem that arises in my mind, once again — perhaps the duplication that arises in my mind—is with the committee that was sitting a couple of weeks ago investigating the costs of education, that was headed by, I believe, Dr. McCarthy. Now what kind of—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Jim, he doesn't head it. He's the executive director. He's a full-time civil servant.

Mr. Sargent: He spends the money. What difference does that—

Mr. Foulds: I just used the name, because it was one that I remembered from the well of my consciousness, and to identify the committee for you. What kind of liaison will there be between these two committees? Will they be duplicating functions? Will one have an input into the other? I raise the question because I have had some misgivings about the select committee investigating the use of school facilities. We can talk about that in more detail at a later point.

It seems to me that we have a number of committees established here that are running off in somewhat different directions; and it seems to me that perhaps there is needless over-duplication.

For example, the legislative members of the select committee were not notified of the hearings of the committee of which Dr. McCarthy is the executive director. If we had known from other than the press reports that I come across in advance, I think some of us would have made an attempt to be present at those meetings so that there could be at least some kind of direct liaison. I'm afraid that the same kind of non-meeting of minds may occur in this case.

I wonder if I could have the minister's comments on that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think these are vastly different committees. The committee on the cost of education is headed by Mr. Tom McKeown and it is, in all senses of the word, a committee of inquiry, that was appointed and goes about its task the same as the Symons committee did in investigating French language schools. I'm using that as an example of that type of committee; it sets its own

procedures, decides when it will hold its hearings and so forth. I think that if the hon. member dropped them a note, they would be happy to let him know when the hearings are held. They don't even tell me when they are holding their hearings. I generally read about them in the press the same as he does.

Mr. Foulds: I don't feel personally slighted or anything.

Hon. Mr. Wells: When they are completed, they will then present us with reports on the various things they were asked to study, and basically they were asked to study what can be done about the cost of education—is the money that is being put into the system being spent properly, and the whole ambit of things connected with spending and education. That's what they are studying.

This committee on resources allocation is a task force that is basically going to be talking about systems. It's not so much going to be a committee that is going around studying to present a report, but a working committee that's going to be sitting down with boards to try to develop systems with them. It's a working task force from our ministry.

If a board doesn't wish, then it doesn't have to become involved, but if it does wish, it can sit down with this task force and use the expertise on it to help develop systems.

Now because there is a tendency, particularly among professionals, to distrust programme budgeting, particularly in the social area—and I think my friend is aware of this—a lot of people think that perhaps programme budgeting has no relevance. We have tried to put people on there who are representative of all the professions and education so that they can all work together and so that it can't be said that some financial management types are trying to come in and put in a system in a social service area that isn't relevant.

Mr. Foulds: That isn't the right body!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes; and that is why we have a director of education heading this who I know is a very competent person and who will use his contacts, his personality and his expertise to attempt to get boards to sit down with him and co-operate and try to work out together systems that will help them in their own budgeting.

This is all part of this process that we're into where we are saying that the goals have to be established and the methods for evaluating them set. This is going to try to help boards to do this, and to set the systems with which they can do this.

Mr. Foulds: I think I am beginning to follow the differentiation and can appreciate it, but one thing still bothers me to some extent. Presumably the committee studying the costs of education will be bringing in recommendations in terms of priorities in spending, where costs could be cut down or eliminated. Surely that is the kind of information that should be readily available to your task force as well, because it doesn't seem to me that you can devise a spending or budgeting or purchasing system in the abstract. It must be based on the reality of the experience of various school boards throughout the province.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, this is quite right, Mr. Chairman, and as soon as we receive a report pertaining to the costs of education from this committee, it will be made available to all these people so that they will have that study with which to work.

Mr. Foulds: Right.

Still on the first three votes, Mr. Chairman, if I could just pursue one further point on the task force. Is there any deadline for the beginning of its activities, for the final—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Which one?

Mr. Foulds: The task force.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The task force?

Mr. Foulds: Right! Is there a deadline for its final establishment, so that it's ready to move to the assessments of the boards?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well the members of the task force are being assembled now. Mr. Lawless will be down in early June, and I would imagine they will be all appointed within a month or two after that. It's an ongoing thing; it will be operating for about the next four or five years, we envisage, as a permanent thing working with boards.

Mr. Foulds: Fair enough! And the other half of the question, is there a deadline for the report of the committee on the costs of education?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, as with all these commissions and committees that are appointed, there is no absolute deadline. I might say that they have indicated to me they are not going to present one report, and they have already presented a report to me which we haven't tabled yet. It really has nothing to do with the cost of education.

It deals with teacher training and this, they felt, was within their jurisdiction. It isn't really. It is a report that really can be related to the cost of education, but not as directly as I am sure you would relate, or I would relate, their ground rules.

But anyway they have presented the report which is part of our total study which is now going on, and which I had hoped to be able to make public, along with their report, in about three or four weeks on our future programmes for teacher training.

They also hope to have a report, I understand, from the chairman in another three or four weeks on a particular aspect of the cost of education. And I would hope they will be completed by early 1973 or mid-1973.

Mr. Foulds: I am curious about this, not premature report, but revelation about the teacher training report and is this—

Mr. Sargent: Don't talk down to him.

Mr. Foulds: Don't worry, I'll handle everything. I'll build up my own head of steam.

Mr. Sargent: He is in trouble enough now.

Mr. Foulds: The member for Grey-Bruce has his own particular pungent style, and I shall develop my own.

Hon. Mr. Wells: His own?

Mr. Sargent: Give him a helping hand. He needs help.

Mr. Foulds: The report on teacher training —is this the one I have heard vaguely about, that did some studies of the situation at the Lakehead because it was one of the first teacher training institutions associated with the university? And I think that was one of the bases for some of the information in the report?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Which was that? No, of course I am not that familiar with all the things that the McKeown study did. But I don't think that that is the one. The hon. member will probably realize there are a lot of studies that are going on in teacher education.

I wasn't aware when I came into the ministry—and I don't think anybody was aware—that the McKeown committee was preparing their first report on teacher education. It came along, and meanwhile we have been simultaneously doing our own study and preparing our own internal report within our department. We want to present as I say, very soon, the projections for the next four years, and I am sure we will talk about—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Haven't you got two?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Do you mean the McLeod report. Yes, we have that one. That was the one that was done previously.

Mr. Foulds: In fact there is an additional one that I think the Ministry of Colleges and Universities is running—financing university programmes in education, and—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I find every time you turn around there is another report on teacher education.

Mr. Foulds: Well, that is one of the things—

Mr. Sargent: —we are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The thing that bothers me, and puzzles me, is the figures in them are all different.

Mr. Foulds: You know that is one of the things that I wanted—

Mr. Sargent: Who said that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is a fact.

Mr. Foulds: Perhaps that is one of the things that we need to draw together more.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: I wonder if I can move on from these remarks on the costs in this particular area. I am curious, and it has to do with my own lack of familiarity with the administrative programme of the department, I am puzzled over general administration. In this specific item over on the right hand side of the page there are a number of specific items that I would like to touch upon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: I am sorry, I was looking down and I didn't see this dramatic event taking place before my eyes. A change of chairman!

The services in general administration seem to me to be particularly high, $1,563,000 in comparison to services as a proportion of the other budgets that we have listed there. Is this because the services include the special committees such as the task force?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The big bulk of that $1,563,000 is the contractual research, which amounts to about $1.3 million. That's the

area in the vote that is broken down in your estimate page. That is where all that is.

Mr. Foulds: Contractual research?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The contractual research, yes.

Mr. Foulds: And this would include the programmes you announced about a week or 10 days ago?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, some of this we have taken back from OISE. This is the money that, over the last two years, we have been taking back from OISE; the $899,000 that I indicated to you a few minutes ago was an increase in this budget, plus what was already in there from last year—the money from OISE. But it is all contractual research.

Mr. Foulds: Could you explain to me then —what the contractual research is?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, the contractual research is research where we have taken the money back from OISE—and this committee which I have indicated to you is sitting, is going to decide what kind of research we want done. Then it will look around for the people to do it.

Now those grants that we announced the other day are grants-in-aid for research—which is the other way around—where people have submitted the projects. There were over 100 submitted. We decided to fund 35 of those.

Mr. Foulds: So in this area, you decide which topic you want researched? Is that the idea?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is right. We decide the priorities.

If the hon. member would like, I could tell him some of the research projects that are going on now. There is research on HS1; there is a comparative study of six pilot schools and six matched schools; there are studies on the open school concept effectiveness, cyclical review, middle school concept.

Some of this research will be done within our department, you will appreciate. This is the place, for instance, where we will use the money to study the experimental programmes in using early childhood education people teaching junior kindergartens. We will put research money into studying that over the next year.

Then there's increased efficiency in forecasting, utilization of multi-media resources, and rehabilitation of drug users.

Those are some of the things that have been going on already. Now the committee have not made their decisions about what we are going to do this year. They are still working this all out, and I would be happy to make a statement to the House after we finalize all this. It will probably be in another three or four weeks.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, one more point please on these three items if I may. I'd like some clarification on the programmes of cultural exchange. I know the minister referred to these glancingly in one of his previous statements. But I would like perhaps a fuller statement of the programmes involved in cultural exchange. Between which countries or provinces do the exchanges take place? What kind of cultural activities are involved? What language differences are there and so on? If you want to take that as a bit of notice and one of the other members wants to get in, that's fine.

Hon. Mr. Wells: All right. I'll get it for you in a minute. I think I can give you a list of exactly what has happened in the cultural exchange branch.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): A few minutes ago the minister said to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville that they were carrying out some research programmes and one programme was being carried out by a professor, if I remember it correctly, in Windsor.

Now a year or so ago we had a great debate here, or in committee, with regard to OISE. I understood that OISE was carrying out the research programmes for the Department of Education. I would like to know if you are paying for these research programmes as carried out by the different areas in the Province of Ontario—and paying OISE too to carry out these research programmes?

Another question I'd like to ask the minister is, there is an increase in expenditures in administration. I'd like to know by how many you have increased your staff this year; and could the minister give us some idea of how many there are on your staff in the Department of Education for the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wells: First I might just say, Mr. Chairman, that it may be of interest

to the members to know that, in the administration part of our estimates, the direct operating costs of the Department of Education, we actually have an increase this year of 1.4 per cent in our budget, and that represents $661,000. And if you took out the $700,000 that we have in there for the committee on the costs of education, we would actually be operating at a decrease this year in our operating budget of the Department of Education.

Mr. Sargent: It is about time you got even. You have been squandering money for the last five years.

Hon. Mr. Wells: So I think you will see that actually we have been very frugal in our direct operations. That is the direct operations of the department as opposed to the money that we transfer to other jurisdictions, the school boards. Direct operating costs of our department of course represent a very small part of the over $1 billion budget that we have. Our complement for this year is 2,679.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, in regard to this research programme that is completely under your control, I thought that OISE was completely under the control of the Department of Education. Yet you state that you are carrying out research programmes—in other areas, in Windsor as I understand it, on the bread and butter issues. I would like to know what the bread and butter issues are, and is this extra cost of doing this research directly under your control?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I have just read a list of some of the research projects that we are supporting, and as I indicated to the hon. member, these are directly under our control. In about another three or four weeks, when our committee has met, I will be happy to make a statement to the House telling you the research that we are supporting this year.

But we intend to support research that gets at the bread and butter issues. There is a place for all kinds of research. We want to spend a lot of the money that we have available to us now under our control and not that of Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, on things that can be of benefit to the school system; and that is our intent.

Mr. Foulds: Could I just pursue that briefly, all of this research will be done on the Ontario system, within Ontario, will it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would say at the present time yes, the bulk of it will be done on the Ontario system.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Bernie!

Mr. B. Newman: The individuals conducting the research, are they all Canadian students?

Mr. Ferrier: There is discrimination against the hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I couldn't tell the hon. member. Does he want to know whether all the people doing research are Canadian citizens? I am sure that there are people at OISE who are doing research for us who are not Canadian citizens.

Mr. B. Newman: The minister made quite a to-do about the fact that the list of books, the Canadian published books, was made available to all the teachers. Now if you are going to carry on that Canadian concept don't you think that you should likewise give the advantage first to those holding Canadian citizenship, all things being equal, before you employ a foreign national to do research in Ontario educational systems?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce. No, the minister would like to reply.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well I think that is something that would be considered. I might just read the hon. member the directions for the grants-in-aid programme: "If the grant is to be used to employ graduate student assistants, the assistants must be Canadian citizens or landed immigrants."

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. You are very fair, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in my part of the country there are very few of us who can talk intelligently about education because we didn't get—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Wait until they hear that back home!

Mr. Sargent: I don't make any bones about that. I didn't have the luck to get to university and all that jazz, but we have to pay the freight though, and I'm so impressed

with the way this minister can toss around figures. We have, in this vote, we have in the five—

Mr. Chairman: We are on items 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, you know now! You didn't know when I asked you before. I said: "What vote are we talking about?" You said: "Item 1."

Mr. Chairman: It is the first opportunity I had to tell you.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it's good to have you aboard and to know what is going on.

In these votes, the minister has admitted to my colleague from Kent that there are about 2,000 employees in his administration; is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wells: More than that. I think 2,700 and some odd.

Mr. Sargent: All right—2,700, and we are spending about $1 million in entertainment for this group. How do people from the sticks, like me, measure the money you are spending in government? How do we measure these things that you hide—things like entertainment under transportation and communication? Now, what is the breakdown of entertainment for 2,700 employees? How do you relate that $1 million for 2,700 employees? Do you know that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: As is usual with this hon. member's questions, they are completely unintelligible. I don't know what he is talking about.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, I'll spell it out for you. If you look in item 1, you have $49,500 for transportation and communication; in item 2 you are spending $117,000 on transportation and communication. Now we know that you have admitted to us over the months past that it is a guise for entertainment.

Mr. Stokes: That's for travelling.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, where do you cover entertainment then?

An hon. member: Under services.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We don't entertain. All we do is work.

Mr. Sargent: Okay.

Mr. Ferrier: The member is touching on a sensitive nerve. Keep after them.

Mr. Sargent: In every other department of government, Mr. Chairman, we have said that transportation and communication cover entertainment funds.

Mr. Stokes: Just at the sports award banquet.

Mr. Sargent: In this total vote we have about $1 million under transportation and communication for 2,700 employees who are basically stationed in one place. You are spending $1 million to entertain them and communicate and transport them to what?

Mr. Ferrier: There must be a real ball going on in that department.

Mr. Sargent: Does anyone know what is going on?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the figures that I presume the hon. member is talking about, for transportation and communication, are for automobile, airplane and railway travel, as well as for the associated expenses concerned with a person travelling, meals, accommodation and so forth; and for the telephone accounts for the minister's office, general administration, ministry business administration. And that's for a total of 10 people in the minister's office, 71 people in general administration and 123 positions in the ministry business administration section.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, do you have a quorum?

Mr. Sargent: The total in this vote, Mr. Chairman, amounts to over $700,000 for 2,700 people. It is completely unreal that a group of people who are administration people, based in one place, can spend three-quarters of a million dollars in this one department. You say it is not entertainment? It is not for hanky-panky?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A million dollars for hanky-panky?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The hon. member might be interested to know that the largest item in that particular expenditure is just postage, and that amounts to $410,000.

Mr. Bullbrook: True, you keep sending out those circulars!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I am asking for some guidance here from the minister before we get past the administration. I wonder if he could

tell me where we could speak about programmes where this ministry would cooperate with the federal Department of Indian Affairs in giving special assistance to northern communities, as well as the northern corps schools, which are worthy of mention. Do we get into that under administration?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, vote 2202 for the first one.

Mr. Stokes: What about the northern corps schools?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They are under supervision in vote 2202. They're listed.

Mr. Stokes: Right.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: I just wanted to make a brief reference to the research conducted through the various programmes within the ministry and disassociate myself to some extent from the remarks of the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

I don't think that we should be narrowly chauvinistic or nationalistic in terms of awarding research grants. What we want to do with that research money is find out valuable information for our educational system. I would think the majority of that money should be spent in researching our system. But it doesn't matter to me if that is conducted by a person who is not a citizen of Ontario, if he has the interest and the capability and makes the information available to us.

I think it is also a little dangerous to be that narrow in terms of—surely we need to do comparison studies; not only of our system and programmes within our system, but some study of other jurisdictions. In the interest of research, I wanted to put that point on the record for our party.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2201; items 1, 2, and 3 carried?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, before that is carried, I would like to just ask a couple of questions of the minister pertaining to his control of expenditures.

I suppose in a sense the good news has gotten to him already that his colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter), is apparently going to be bearing the brunt of most of the public criticism of so-called overexpenditure, since he has surpassed this department with his $2,028,145,000; and with university affairs we are just a bit under that.

There is a tendency, I think, for the people to more and more accept the level of expenditure in the education department. For that reason there is probably not so much interest in what I have come to call the McCarthy committee; but is actually chaired by—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. McKeown.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. McKeown? I think it was about a year ago when the minister's predecessor announced with some fanfare that the government was coming to grips with the cost of education and the appointment of a committee, with its executive director the former deputy, to examine into these costs.

I will tell you one of the surprising things that the minister has told us tonight is that their primary concern seems to be teacher training; and the minister himself has indicated that he is loaded down with reports of committees—select and minister's committees and others—on the whole matter of teacher training.

I recall the minister's predecessor about three years ago, I mean the Premier (Mr. Davis), making a definitive statement on teacher training; that it was going to be allied with university education. He seemed to have most of the answers coming from the reports that he had commissioned in years gone by. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the committee; and I suppose it should be designated a minister's committee on the costs of education; should—

Hon. Mr. Wells: It was appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is it then a royal commission? It has a royal commission then to carry out its function. Surely an investigation into teachers training is an odd place for them to start, if in fact they are concerning themselves with the cost of education. We had envisaged, certainly as a response the then-minister's statement, that this committee was going to meet with school boards and get some idea of the problems they have with the escalation in costs, particularly of administration at the country board level.

I am surprised that the minister has either directed or allowed them to direct themselves into an area that in many ways has been over-researched; with many recommendations from qualified people in the profession and

outside of the profession dealing with teacher training.

I suppose one tends to look back more than one ought; and one looks at various ministers and deputy ministers and the marks, the stamps that they have left on the department. We recall the famous Robarts plan of the early Sixties—the streaming that the former Premier brought into effect when he was Minister of Education; a streaming which has been substantially discounted now, with the experts in education pooh-poohing any approach toward directing the interests of the student in any way, and allowing him to select, almost as if he were in a cafeteria, from all of the programmes that are available.

This is the stance that the present minister takes, which of course is 10 years later than the statement associated with the Robarts plan.

But the present Premier, when Minister of Education, was associated I suppose with his own stamp in education, that money will buy excellence and that nothing should stand in the way of buying anything that might contribute to an improvement in the education system.

Now this minister seems to find his stock in trade in at least a discussion of cutting costs, at the same time of course improving the matters pertaining to quality, as if money did not buy quality—a feeling that perhaps many of us would agree with when we look at the results of the administration of the department over a good many years.

But the only thing that the minister has done with the department is what he called a full reorganization at the top. I think he's been fairly successful as far as one aspect of reorganization is concerned. As we look around the principal advisers that he has brought with him, with great respect, there are not too many familiar faces.

Jack McCarthy is now doing whatever he is doing in advising somebody to advise the minister on teacher-training. We look at the other competent officials who are here to advise the minister from time to time, and I hate to admit it that not many of them are known to me, and perhaps not entirely all of them to our critic. In this connection I think it might be worthwhile if the minister, as the functionaries change—and I see they have already been moving in and out a couple of times—that he might introduce them to us.

We are aware of the deputy, of course. I was mentioning to him earlier that his doctoral thesis is prominently displayed in the library. It deals with the evolution of education policy from, I think, 1962, and there are a few pages dealing with the years from 1792 up to 1962. It's certainly an impressive thesis indeed.

Among many of the other principal advisers there are a few familiar faces. The ETV director seems to be with us again tonight, and some others. But we would like to know just who really is running the educational bureaucracy, if I may use that word.

One thing, Mr. Chairman, before we pass the minister's office estimates, that I would like to bring to his attention, is the singular lack of opportunity we have as members of the House to get to know the principal advisers in the department, and those people out of the department who are the major spokesmen and policy administrators in education.

There was a time when this House was served by a standing committee on education which was not encumbered with other subjects. During those days we got to know the chairman of the Toronto board by his first name; we knew who the director of education was for Toronto; we knew the names—and perhaps we could call them by their first names — of the presidents of Queen's, Carleton, the University of Toronto and so on. We had a chance, if we as private members opted for service in that committee, to feel that after a certain period of time we had established if not an expertise, at least an acquaintance with the people who were quite deeply involved with the changing problems in education.

I think it's a commentary on what has happened to the concern for this very important vote of close to $2 billion that the House, as usual when we are discussing the education estimates, is almost empty. There is a feeling on the part of most of the members that—

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, but the best ones are all here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's right, that's right. The reverend sir is correct. He and I are here, the minister and a few others.

Mr. Bullbrook: And the good doctor!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But it seems to me that there should be a much deeper concern for a discussion not only of the dollars being spent in support of this programme, but of

some of the philosophies that have been applied to changing programmes.

Of course we are concerned with the expenditure. The minister makes quite an impression when he talks about his ceilings, and how he is able to maintain, and in fact, elevate quality while at the same time either holding the line or reducing expenditures in certain areas.

But we are concerned with the quality of education. Simply because his colleague, the Minister of Health, now spends more money doesn't in any way mean that this is no longer the most important ministry of government. Obviously it is. There can be no more important endeavour in the public service, either elected or appointed, than in dealing with the provision of educational facilities and the policy and the philosophy that motivates the administration.

More specifically, I would like the minister to tell us what he has achieved by the so-called reorganization at the top level. We have got new people, certainly. It must be sometimes a difficult proposition indeed to get new advisors at the top level when those that a minister inherits are not superannuation level as yet.

I suppose education policy moves very quickly. I can recall one of the minister's predecessors seconding a former director of education from Toronto, Mr. Phimister, that many people remember with almost reverence, who when he moved to the provincial level, never made an impact. His minister had been there before him. Instead of providing ideas for the minister and giving some sort of leadership, he found himself in the secondary position, and I think in many ways never felt fulfilled even at that higher level of responsibility.

The former deputy was appointed, I suppose in preference to some more senior people in the department when his day came to have a period as the top administrative officer. Now he finds himself as the executive director of a committee which is charged with reviewing the expenditures which he himself authorized.

I think, Mr. Chairman, you may have heard me say before that Dr. McCarthy and I studied together at a noted institute of educational learning, the Ontario College of Education, he at a graduate level and I trying to attain a certificate to teach. I always admired the gentleman's ability. I think that my remarks in no way detract from what he could contribute, and I hope is contributing to the development of an education system in this province—particularly one that economically uses the dollars that we vote in its support.

But now we have got a new minister, a minister who has had a number of responsibilities in just a few months, in fact. He is the first minister to operate the department—

Mr. Sargent: A real winner, every one of them! A real winner!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —under the general direction of a policy minister, who interestingly enough has not seen fit to attend tonight. The immediate past minister, the member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch), is busy elsewhere developing policy, perhaps in some other field.

It is difficult for us on this side, when we look at the expenditures we are asked to approve, to swallow that bill of goods that has been put to us by the ministry and the Premier—that we now have an overall policy jurisdiction which correlates education with certain other ministerial aspects, when the policy minister himself does not attend.

So, Mr. Chairman, when you are threatening to carry item 2 which pays the minister's salary, and the whole aspect of general administration—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Fear not, fear not; not for some time!

Mr. Nixon: —it seems to me that we should have a more specific report as to how the realignment of responsibilities at the top level under the minister have been an improvement. These people that he has brought forward certainly look to be competent and ready to supply answers, not only to the minister but to any member who might contact them. But as far as the efficiency of the department is concerned we can't detect any particular change.

The minister presented us with a 24-page opening statement couched in the same generalities that have been put forward by his predecessors for many years. But surely he must be looking for some means to convince the electorate, if not the members of the Legislature, that the $2 billion that he has under his direction is going to in fact be spent for the improvement of quality, and that we can look forward to an improvement in the situation as compared with what we have experienced for the last 10 years.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the fact that

the Minister of Health now carries the burden of administering the most expensive department, in no way should it take any pressure from this department in providing a level of service at an efficiency much improved over what we have experienced in the past. I wonder if the minister can report to us on the results of so far his only decision as minister, and that is to reorganize the department from the top?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Do others want to speak first before I reply?

Mr. Bullbrook: We are not on second reading of any bill. Get up and respond.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I wanted to go on to a separate item.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'll listen.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with items 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I would like to go into that matter—

Mr. Sargent: I have one question. On 1, 2 and 3, Mr. Chairman, I have a question with regard to—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, have I been recognized?

Mr. Chairman: Pardon?

Mr. Shulman: Have I been recognized?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, if you are on items 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. Shulman: I am.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Sargent: Sorry—give him hell, Morty.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, actually I am afraid I am going to give him hell, but I rise more in sorrow than in anger, because I had hoped that the minister had finally found his niche after his previous failures. Apparently not. What I would like to—

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Look who is talking.

Mr. Yakabuski: Eddie, you have got a pal.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Personal attacks!

Mr. Sargent: I have two or three, Paul. They'll get you too.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, what I would like to discuss is the minister's office and the action of the minister, in particular in relation to the financial crunch which he says we are suffering and the great things he is doing about it. I, unfortunately, had an experience involving the minister, involving a financial matter in his department; I was led to believe that he was going to take the proper action and was quite shocked to find he did not, and I think it very important it go on the record so we'll—

Hon. Mr. Wells: This comes under vote 2203.

Mr. Shulman: Oh no it doesn't. This comes under your activity, because you are going to have to take the responsibility for this.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am responsible for everything in the department.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I am now talking about your salary which it says here—

Mr. Yakabuski: It's your bomb. Why don't you drop it?

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you resign?

Mr. Shulman: Your salary comes under this and I don't think you are earning it, and that's what I'm discussing right now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am earning it more than you are earning yours.

Mr. Shulman: Well, perhaps the members of the House will come to some different conclusion after they have heard what I have to say.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I know exactly what you are going to say.

Mr. Shulman: You know, but they don't know, and it's important they should know, and it's important that the public should know, and the public is going to know if I have to write a column about it. Well now—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Go ahead!

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Of course, you charge about $1,000 an hour.

Mr. Chairman: Order, the member may—

Mr. Yakabuski: Let's have it, Morty.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, one of the major expenditures—

Mr. Sargent: How much do they pay you for that column?

Mr. Shulman: Not enough, Eddie, not enough!

One of the major expenditures under this department is the supplemental aid, which comes under 2203, which is given by the province to various school boards.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we will leave that. We'll discuss that when we come to 2203. We are on items 1, 2 and 3 of vote 2201.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, thank you very much. Right now I want to discuss the minister's salary and the minister's role in the waste of money.

Mr. Sargent: You can't block it, Bill.

Mr. Chairman: As far as the minister's salary is concerned, it is statutory.

Mr. Shulman: It may be statutory, and I am sure Mr. Chairman, you have been here many, many times and many, many votes when it has been recommended that his salary be reduced to $1, and I have seen that vote taken a hundred times, so surely you're not going to suggest that I can't do that tonight—statutory or otherwise.

Mr. Havrot: We'll gladly vote on that.

Mr. Yakabuski: That is an exaggeration. You are stretching it again, Morty.

Mr. Sargent: Let him talk.

Mr. Shulman: All right, to come back to the beginning, we'll save a lot of trouble if we just go ahead without arguing about which vote it should come under.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We've got to go by the votes in the estimates.

Mr. Shulman: The situation is, Mr. Chairman, that a series of tenders were given in New Liskeard—

Mr. Havrot: Oh boy, not that again!

Mr. Chairman: It's not in this vote.

Mr. Shulman: I beg your pardon, sir. If you'll bear with me, we'll come to the part that is in this vote, which is the involvement of the minister. And it's the part that comes—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Vote 2203 has nothing to do with that vote.

Mr. Chairman: Look, let's get along with items 1, 2 and 3. Never mind hedging around; get to the items.

Mr. Shulman: Well, we are going to be here for two days if you keep interrupting. I have just as much patience as you have. What I'm talking about is—I'll repeat it again if the Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: As far as the Chairman is concerned, if the hon. member for High Park wants to be here for two days, I spend a lot more time in this Legislature than he does, so I'm—

Mr. Shulman: Okay, just relax and don't get your blood pressure up, because we're going to go through with it whether you like it or not, and the minister's going to have to hear it and the minister's going to have to explain it.

All right, as I was saying when I was—

Mr. Yakabuski: Morty should be in the air force in Vietnam.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Be nice to the Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: All right. As I was saying when the Chairman began to assist me, in New Liskeard tenders were sent out for the purchase of a new school; there were seven tenders, one of which was from a local contractor, the other six were from contractors from southern Ontario.

To the dismay of all the local politicians, when the tenders were opened, the local favourite had not submitted the lowest tender. The politicians met up in New Liskeard, the Timiskaming Board of Education met and decided they shouldn't pay too much attention to giving the contract to the fellow who gave the lowest tender. "We'll give it to our local favourite." The name of the firm happens to be Clark and Co.

Mr. Yakabuski: They don't want carpet-baggers from the south.

Mr. Shulman: Of course they don't want carpet-baggers. They're not interested in the cost of education. We've been hearing some nonsense from your minister that they're interested in the cost of education, but he didn't really mean that.

I hope the interjection is on the record that they're not interested in the carpet-baggers of the south. They're not interested in having the lowest price; they're just interested in giving it to their local favourite.

Mr. Yakabuski: Oh no!

Mr. Havrot: They want quality.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): It provides jobs for the boys at home.

Mr. Shulman: Well all right, we've got that on the record.

Mr. Ferrier: Timmins gave it to the carpetbaggers from the south.

Mr. Shulman: Well, the board of education up there weren't too interested in the cost, so they said, "We'll give it to our local favourite here, and to heck with the lowest bidder." Let me say this caused some dismay, not just for the contractor who didn't win the award, but also among all the other contractors, as a result of which numerous representations were made to the minister and his department. I'm not going to go through them all; I have a thick pile of them. It's rather intriguing that all of these representations received no reply from the minister. However—

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's not true.

Mr. Shulman: Well, that's what they say, and here's the letter saying they didn't.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is all you can ever say.

Mr. Havrot: Specify the different tenders!

Mr. Shulman: Well don't let the minister worry. I'm going to read the reply I received from them in full, so his position will be on the record and there will be no confusion about that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's why you were given the reply, so you could read it.

Mr. Shulman: Right. I think it's very important that the minister—

Hon. Mr. Wells: But don't say that they weren't replied to, because people phone to—

Mr. Yakabuski: What was the difference? Was it more than a dollar?

Mr. Shulman: What was the difference? The difference was some thousands of dollars.

Mr. Havrot: How many thousands.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I'll give you the exact figure.

Mr. Havrot: Give us the facts.

Mr. Shulman: The exact difference was $7,000.

Mr. Havrot: How much does it represent in the total contract? What is the percentage?

Mr. Shulman: Very little, and the member—where are you from? Oh, it's the member for Timiskaming—the member for Timiskaming shows so little knowledge. It isn't the $7,000 on this particular tender that is the problem, because obviously he doesn't understand what the problem is here.

Mr. Havrot: You don't either.

Mr. Shulman: The contractors from the south, once they realize—they now realize it, and I'm going to produce proof of that very shortly—once they realize that the lowest tender is no longer being accepted in that area, they are going to cease tendering up there. Now once the competition ceases, the prices go up. And even the dullest member for Timiskaming must understand that.

Mr. Havrot: And you're so bright.

Mr. Shulman: I don't have to be polite to idiots. You should understand that simple thing.

Mr. Havrot: Bright, bright, bright!

Hon. Mr. Wells. I hope you don't ever go up there on your holidays.

Mr. Havrot: Okay sunshine.

Mr. Shulman: It isn't just the thousands of dollars that are lost in the initial contract, it's the fact that when you tell people we are no longer going to have true competition, the other competitors stop competing. Then the one guy who comes bidding; he's going to get the tender and he'll put in any price he wants. You're going to pay more and we're going to pay more in our taxes because you people don't understand the tendering system.

Mr. Gilbertson: Maybe the other contractor will do a better job. The board uses its discretion.

Mr. Shulman: I'm sure he'll do a better job—and a more expensive job. And we're supposed to be interested in the cost up here. These things are all laid out in blueprints; they all have to bid on the same job.

Mr. Sargent: We're not building a bridge!

Mr. Shulman: You're not passing out a local little plum up there; you're supposed to be building a building at the lowest possible cost so as to keep our taxes down. Don't you understand that?

Mr. Gilbertson: It probably will be in the long run.

Mr. Shulman: In the long run it is going to cost you much more because of your policies.

Mr. Yakabuski: What sort of firm submitted the low tender?

Mr. Shulman: I think perhaps we should come to that. I have a letter here from the Ontario—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Well, the name of the firm was G.S. Wark Ltd. of Hamilton. I have a letter here from the Ontario General Contractors Association which was sent to the Superintendent of Architectural Services of the Ontario Department of Education. I am not going to read it all, but I am going to read the important part because this should be on the record and I quote:

Mr. Chairman: Architectural services comes under 2203, so if you are dealing with architectural services you will have to come back some other day and discuss it.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I will come back some other day and discuss it, but in the meanwhile, Mr. Chairman, if you can try and understand, I am coming to the minister's role in this and if you will allow me to lay the groundwork—

Mr. Sargent: Let him talk, let him talk!

Mr. Shulman: If you wish to keep interrupting we will get at it anyway, but it will take a little longer. Now to quote:

> According to our information, the low bidder, G.S. Wark Ltd., submitted a proper tender for this project. In the conditions of tendering there was absolutely no reference made to the possibility or probability of preference being given to local bidders over those bidders from other localities. There can be absolutely no question whatsoever, and this applies particularly to public authorities at various levels involved in the expenditure of public funds, that in this kind of situation the low bidder should be awarded the contract.
>
> We understand that the architects made a check on the firm some two weeks or more before tender closing date. No question was raised as a result of this inquiry as to the suitability of the low bidder for the contract award.
>
> We are informed that G.S. Wark Ltd. complied with all the instructions to bidders and submitted a formal tender.
>
> We would repeat that under these circumstances there should be no question but that the low bidder has qualified. He has submitted the lowest price and therefore has won the competition, and as a consequence of that he should be awarded the contract.
>
> We understand that the second bidder, or in any event the bidder whom the local board may be considering for the contract award, is located in or near the municipality where the project may be built. The matter of the location of the offices of the bidder should clearly not be a factor in the contract award decision. If such a factor were to be considered it would lead to some ridiculous extremes. It must be clearly borne in mind that tendering on a project is not a competition between taxpaying companies from various localities, but it is a competition between contractors who meet the requirements laid out in the tendering documents.
>
> Moreover, it is absurd, particularly for a public authority, for them to hold a competition under one set of rules and then after the competition is over change the rules by saying in effect that local bidders get preference over all other bidders. Surely this is a denial of the principles of fair and equal competition and it would be difficult, we believe, for anyone to justify such a change of rules in any debate whether on the floor of the Ontario Legislature or elsewhere.

That is signed by E. R. Fenton, executive director, Ontario General Contractors Association. It is dated April 5, 1972.

Numerous letters were sent in to the department, and sad to say, no response was received.

It is an interesting situation up in New Liskeard. The school board has 13 members, of whom two at least are connected with the local firm that finally received the contract. Those two did not vote, but the fact remains that they are on the board and they have influence upon the board. Their names are Mr. Bowman and Mr. Ebert.

It was obviously a mistake. I asked a question in the House of the minister, and subsequent to that question he indicated he had a reply for me. I met with him privately and he told me that his department was sending a letter to the Timiskaming School Board refusing to approve the contract.

Quite frankly, I was surprised; pleasantly surprised. I complimented the minister at the time. I thought, "Good Lord, maybe I have been wrong about him. Maybe he has finally found his spot and maybe Education is the spot for him." I thought, "Well, perhaps I have been wrong. Perhaps I should give him a second thought. Maybe there is some hope for him."

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have never been wrong about you, that's for sure.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I called up the contractors' association and I said, "Well, some common sense has asserted itself down in Queen's Park. Strangely enough it comes from Tom Wells, and even though there is no sense up at Timiskaming, the right thing is being done and Mr. Wells has sent out a letter disallowing that contract."

Mr. Sargent: Good for you.

Mr. Shulman: I went along in this little idle dream for several days and then I received a phone call from someone in the contractors' association who said I must have been misinformed. "We have just been informed today that Mr. Wells has given permission—changed his mind—"

Mr. Yakabuski: The member is often misinformed. There is no question about that.

Mr. Shulman: "—and given permission so that the lowest tender need not be accepted and they are actually going to give it to their local firm."

Mr. Sargent: Away we go!

Mr. Shulman: Let me say I was a little upset, to put it mildly. I sent him a rather nasty letter saying, "Tell me it isn't true, Tommyboy, because I can't really believe that even you could do this." I got a letter back from him and I think his letter should go on the record because I think the members of this House should know just how this department works to waste our money and raise our taxes.

Mr. Yakabuski: Table it!

Mr. Shulman: I'll table it all right and the member will be under that table. The letter is addressed to me; it is dated May 25, and it reads as follows:

Dear Dr. Shulman:

Thank you very much for your recent letter concerning the situation of the Timiskaming Board of Education and the new proposed secondary school for French-language students in New Liskeard. Enclosed you will find a copy of a summary outlining the events which have taken place with respect to this particular situation.

Cordially,

Thomas L. Wells,
Minister.

I am going to read the attached letter in full with no omissions so that everyone will know exactly what the minister did here.

Summary of events

The Timiskaming Board of Education and the proposed new French-language secondary school in New Liskeard, Ontario.

There had been a decision on the part to award a contract for the construction of the Timiskaming Board of Education of this school to a contractor whose tender was not the lowest. The decision was apparently reached at a meeting of the board in mid-April and was then communicated to both the contractors who were under the consideration.

As is the usual practice, the board then entered a request to have Ministry of Education approval for the project. As I indicated to the member, we reviewed this request and replied that it was not possible, from a purely technical point of view, to issue a final approval. The reasons given for selecting the second low bidder were not, in the opinion of my technical staff, acceptable.

As a result of this decision, the Timiskaming Board of Education requested a meeting with officials of the ministry. The first of several meetings was held on May 2, at which time we explored with the board, the reservations that they had, concerning the low bidder which led to their selection. We reiterated, at that meeting, that from a purely technical point of view, we were still not in a position to issue an official approval.

At that point in time, discussions held within the ministry determined that the most appropriate course of action would be to attempt to arrange a meeting with the board and the contractor in question. This we attempted to do but were unable to overcome the board's opposition to meeting further with the second low bidder.

On Monday, May 15, I met with the Timiskaming Board of Education in order to determine for myself what, in this case, was the most appropriate course of action. From my discussion with the board, it was apparent to me that there was no hope of the board and the low bidder ever developing an effective co-operative working relationship. I pointed out to the board a number of disadvantages that would accompany choosing the second low bid and was satisfied that the board had taken all this into account.

One of the essential ingredients in this particular case is that of local board responsibility. The board, in choosing the second low tender, exercised their authority and in doing so it should be noted that they had great support at the local level. This support, incidentally, included that of the member of this Legislature for Timiskaming and the member for the federal House of Commons as well, Mr. Arnold Peters.

Mr. Ferrier: Great man!

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

We have, therefore, indicated to the Timiskaming Board of Education, in a letter dated May 17, 1972, that the final approval of the Ministry of Education for this project is now in preparation and will be issued within the next day or two.

This letter re-emphasized several of the points that we made regarding the tendering procedures of the Timiskaming board. This letter also emphasized that it is the responsibility of the board of education to decide as to who shall build its schools and the board must be prepared to accept any consequences which develop from such a decision. Since it is the policy of the Ministry of Education under our capital aid programme to expect the board to accept the lowest tender unless there are just and valid reasons for deviating from this principle, and since the ministry subscribes to the principles of fair and equitable bidding practices, the board was advised that if it accepted the second lowest bidder, the amount finally approved for purposes of grants would be based upon the amount of the lowest bidder.

Well let's take a look at this, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think it is.

Mr. Yakabuski: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Shulman: Well that the Conservative backbenchers don't understand it, I can understand. But if the minister doesn't understand, this is a little disturbing. So I'd better explain it to him in little words of not more than two syllables, and perhaps it will get through. Perhaps. It may take a little time.

Hon. Mr. Wells. I understand it.

Mr. Shulman: What is wrong with this first of all is this is the third occasion in that area that this same contractor has been given a contract for construction of a building up there, even though he was not the lowest bidder. This is now well known. This has now been printed in the magazine which is distributed to all the contractors across this province. There is no point in going up and spending money in bidding in that area because you are not going to get the contract anyway.

Now I tell you right now, that if you start measuring the price of contracts in that area compared to other areas, from here on in it is going to be considerably higher, because you are not going to have any true competition. That is the first thing that is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'll bet you on that.

Mr. Shulman: The members in the back benches there will have some difficulty in understanding this. But as they think it over, perhaps some of it will sink through.

The second thing that is wrong is that the minister has abdicated all responsibility here. The reasons he has given for finally reversing himself and letting them go ahead with this —let's just look at what the reasons are.

The board has had great support at the local level. They got the support of the local gentleman for Timiskaming, the Conservative, and the support of the local federal NDP'er Mr. Peters. And this is the reason why we should put aside all common sense and give in and take the expensive tender. This is the reason he gives. What other reasons does he give in this letter? He doesn't give any other reason.

The only other thing he does to sort of salve his conscience, which doesn't really help at all, is to base his grant on the lowest tender which will help not in the slightest. It prevents our having to pay higher taxes down here on this particular project, but it doesn't undo any of the bad effects that are going to come from the project in the future.

What does it mean when the minister sends out a letter saying "I am not going to approve that project," and they up there in Timiskaming say, "Well we don't have to worry about the minister's letter; we are just going to go down and show him"? So they come down, and they meet him, and they say, "You are going to approve the project". And he says, "No, please fellows. Please meet with the low bidder and talk with him." And they say, "No, we are not going to meet with the low bidder and talk with him. We want to give it to our friend Clark". And he says, "Well, if you feel that way about it, I guess there is not much I can do."

What kind of a minister is that? Do you think Bob Welch would have done that? You know damn well he wouldn't.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, he would.

Mr. Shulman: Show some backbone over there.

Mr. Havrot: Get the facts.

Mr. Shulman: You've got the facts. Now I am trying to explain them to you.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear, this policy is going to waste education funds over a period of years to come, which will affect all of us but primarily building in the north. It is a negation of the declared policy of the minister, which is to hold a ceiling on education, and to keep costs down. He is wasting money in a place where it is sheer waste, and he is saving money in places where it is needed.

We have schools all across the province that are doing without essentials, that are laying off people that they need, that are cutting back on the number of teachers and their salaries. On the one hand he claims this is necessary to save funds, while on the other he spews it out because he hasn't got the guts to stand up to a few local politicians who are trying to pander to the local vote, and trying to pander to the local contractor who gives them a donation.

Now I say this right to you, Mr. Minister, through you Mr. Chairman, your policies do not stand up to principle. If you are going to have a principle, for God's sake stand behind it. If you could say, we have got all the money in the world and don't care about it, fine, then spend it as you wish. If you really truly have an education ceiling, a financial ceiling, and you are saying we want to save money and you mean it, then you can't carry out things like this and expect us to have any respect for you whatsoever. Because your policies are bankrupt. They show no principle. You say one thing, and you do another.

Now you have done this before in Social and Family services. You have done it in the Ministry of Health, and we are still paying for those little mistakes. For God's sake, don't lead us down the garden path again.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious that the member for High Park hasn't changed. He is still—

Mr. Sargent: It is a form of corruption.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think he is obsessed with some paranoid condition about me, because I frankly recall that he made a speech, I think down at the Toronto Education Centre, where he criticized me for one hour. I got a copy of that speech and I—

Mr. Shulman: It was only five minutes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I was so enamoured with the fact that this person would do this that I sent it to a psychiatrist friend of mine. I really failed to see—this fellow has blind spots on his eyes—and he continues to deal in personal innuendo which is his stock and trade. But I will—

Mr. Shulman: And the minister never does!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —stand in this House, Mr. Chairman, and take—

Mr. Havrot: By his trademark you shall know him!

Hon. Mr. Wells: —full responsibility for the situation concerning the French-language school in New Liskeard. I think that I took the responsibility that any responsible minister would take.

My officials—and the statement has been read—sent the letter, based on the policy of this department, that unless there are just and valid reasons we encourage the low tender being accepted. We sent that letter to the Timiskaming board as was indicated here. We were then informed that the Timiskaming board wanted to meet with us and I met with them.

I had my officials meet with them because it was obvious that this was not a matter of just passing concern. There was great com-

munity interest in this; there were many people in the community who appeared at the meeting to support the acceptance of the second lowest tender. There was enough concern there that I felt I had to become involved in this, whereas normally this would be a matter that would be handled by the officials of my department.

In meeting with this board it became very obvious to me that there was a degree of animosity between the board and the lowest bidder in this case that I think would mitigate against effective relationships so that a school such as this could be built. As I say, in the interval of two or three weeks during which I considered this, it became very obvious to me.

I will accept in this House full responsibility for these actions because the minister can't sit in his office every day and not make decisions. I will take responsibility for the decisions I make. It became obvious to me that if we forced the board to take the low bidder—which was only $7,000 lower than the second bidder on about a $2.3 million contract—if we forced them to do that, they probably wouldn't build that school.

On the other hand, I had a pile of telegrams from the French-speaking community in that area, threatening and telling us that we were holding up the building of that French-language school which is needed. I felt that that French-language school had to be built in that area.

As I say, after assessing the situation and meeting with the board and becoming aware —incidentally, the hon. member said that those letters went unanswered. He knows that members of my staff spent many hours discussing this whole matter with the low bidder. Another member of this Legislature brought the low bidder into our office and we had discussions with him.

There was a degree of animosity between them which I think mitigated against the contract being properly fulfilled in the manner in which we would all expect it would. When I got the board down, and I listened to them and then I said to them, "It's your responsibility to let this contract. You know that we always want the low tender taken. You know and I know that on your contract you say you don't necessarily have to accept the low bidder. Now, we prefer—and I think you would be better off, everybody would be better off—that you take the low bidder but obviously you feel you don't want to." As I say, these reasons, which were not necessarily the reasons for public support in favour of the second lowest bidder, changed my mind; there was the degree of animosity that seemed to have been built up between the low bidder and the board.

I said to the board, "I think my only decision to you can be that you have got to take the responsibility. You know our policy; it suggests that you accept the low bidder but you can take the responsibility if you want to award it to the second-lowest bidder. If you do, we will not approve that bid for grant purposes and we will only approve grants on the amount of the lowest tender. That's one of the consequences of your action, and you will have to take any other local consequences."

I didn't abdicate my responsibility in it. I said, "We will give our final approval on the project" which is the last of four approvals that we normally give, because I felt that the school—this needed French school—probably wouldn't be built when it should be built and as quickly as it should be built.

That's the whole situation, Mr. Chairman. I will take responsibility for it but I think in this case I acted in the manner a Minister of Education should act. I think it's in the manner that most of my predecessors would have acted in this particular case.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

Mr. Havrot: Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is time that I got into this little bit of a donnybrook here with—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Renfrew South has the floor first.

Mr. Havrot: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Renfrew South has the floor.

Mr. Havrot: Renfrew South? Let him go.

Mr. Yakabuski: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it would only be right for me to relinquish my time to the hon. member for Timiskaming—

Mr. Ferrier: Why don't you yield to your colleague?

Mr. Yakabuski: —but since I am on my feet, I did want to—

Mr. Sargent: How did you get up there?

Mr. Yakabuski: —comment on the matter raised by the member for High Park. I have to say that I completely agree with the action the minister took on this occasion.

An hon. member: I am surprised.

Mr. Shulman: We are shocked.

Mr. Yakabuski: I think there is a lot of merit in that clause, "lowest tender not necessarily accepted." There are many things a board or any other body must consider when granting or approving a tender. I think one of the things that would be considered is that the local contractor would provide much needed employment to local people, and $7,000 isn't very much money when the carpetbagger or the other contractor from southern Ontario could move in with an entire crew and deprive local men of various trades of much needed employment.

But that isn't the only thing, Mr. Chairman. Various boards, hospital boards and school boards and others, have gotten their fingers burned on occasions before with this low-bid concept. I am going to the opening of a new wing on the Arnprior District Memorial Hospital next Tuesday. That wing is opening almost a year behind schedule for the simple reason that the Arnprior District Hospital Board accepted the lowest tender.

Mr. Shulman: You should never accept the lowest tender?

Mr. Yakabuski: Consequently, hospital beds that are much needed in that area have not been made available for that very reason. So I think when all of the circumstances are taken into consideration, there are many times when the lowest tender should not be accepted. In view of the minister's explanation here to the Legislature tonight, I would have to agree with him in the action he took in the case of the Timiskaming board.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Havrot: Mr. Chairman, you know at one time I had a considerable deal of respect for the hon. member for High Park. I used to think that he was a real white knight on a black horse, or a black horse on a white knight.

Mr. Shulman: The other way around—a black knight on a white horse.

Mr. Havrot: Anyway, in the last while, the member for High Park has been able to pick up any piece of garbage and start throwing it around in this House without first getting the facts.

One point I would like to stress is about the $7,000 involved. You say, "this is $7,000 of my money," but let me cite to you a situation in the addition to the high school in New Liskeard that was built by an outside contractor last year. It cost the board an additional $25,000 to put on a new roof, which leaked about six months after it was built.

It is all right for you to stand up here and criticize the decision of the Timiskaming School Board and criticize the minister. I can assure you that the minister gave the board a rough time in making his decision, and the board had to give him a reasonable answer as to why they were accepting the second lowest tender.

Mr. Shulman: It was what?

Mr. Havrot: It wasn't just a matter of politics as you think it is. It was a matter of common sense and the saving of dollars and cents. I might add—

Mr. Shulman: That's about it.

Mr. Havrot: —that while I was reeve of the municipality of the township of Teck in 1970, we took the occasion to accept a low contract from a southern Ontario contractor which was $13,000 less on a $190,000 contract. By September, the contract was bankrupt and we had to go into court and settle the problem.

So, I don't think you are too aware of the situations that we face in northern Ontario.

Another thing, you sort of laugh at this, you sit back there like a big fat cat—

Mr. Shulman: I won't be the only one laughing when this is finished.

Mr. Havrot: —but just remember one thing, that a $2 million contract means a lot up in our area. Down here in the city nobody pays any attention to it. But in a community such as New Liskeard—and if you ever go up there I would like to see you walk down the street and you'll find how clannish these people are. They have an extreme pride in their community. It is not like down here in southern Ontario where you don't know your next-door neighbour. There is a different situation in our area.

Mr. Shulman: We are aware of that.

Mr. Havrot: Another thing, I might add that the low tenderer was incompatible with the board, similar to the member for High Park, he's just the same obnoxious type of individual who would get up and threaten the board with action if he didn't get the contract.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Is this a sermon or a lecture?

Mr. Deans: What has this to do with it?

Mr. Havrot: Your man started it, don't start saying what this has got to do with it.

Mr. Shulman: I started it and I'm going to finish it too, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is this on the same point?

Mr. Shulman: Same point.

Mr. Chairman: Well we'd better let this continue then. The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Well I'm rather intrigued by the reply, from the backbenchers first of all, I'll get to the minister in a minute.

Mr. Sargent: You haven't had the floor yet.

Mr. Shulman: Sure I have. On the same point, if I might—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, who had the floor?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Sargent: You don't have to ask him.

Mr. Shulman: The backbenchers have made the point, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. member: He is a member not a backbencher.

Mr. Sargent: Who had the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I believe this is a continuing discussion so the member could continue.

Mr. Shulman: Come on; we are continuing the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, the members for Timiskaming and Renfrew South have made the point that we shouldn't accept low tenders. The member for Renfrew South says we musn't take the low tender because then the hospital is going to be finished late. There is a certain logic there which we will have to—

Mr. Yakabuski: I gave you an example and you are trying to distort it.

Mr. Shulman: —which we will have to think through. The member for Timiskaming has talked about "the southern Ontario carpet-baggers" who come in and give less employment.

Mr. Havrot: I never said anything about carpet-baggers.

Mr. Shulman: I'm sorry, your friend from Renfrew South used the word carpet-baggers. But the point that he has made is that the local contractor should be given the contract, and this is really what it is all about. And if his words are heard—and obviously they have been heard in the ministry, and obviously they have been heard by the general contractors association—the southern Ontario carpet-baggers, as our friends over there call them, are not going to go up to the north and they are not going to bid and you are going to have J. Clark and company getting all the contracts without competitive tender, and you are going to pay more for it, and we are going to pay more for it.

The thing that bothers me is, we have heard a great deal from the backbenchers and from the minister about the incompatability and how this terrible, terrible aggressive man got up when he found the lowest tender wasn't accepted and complained bitterly. Of course he complained bitterly. Suppose you had gone up and spent all that money and put in a competitive tender—

Mr. Havrot: Did you ever ask a question when the contract was awarded?

Mr. Shulman: —and it was the lowest tender and then you are told you are not getting it. Of course you are going to complain. Use some common sense.

What possible reason—I'm still waiting and no reason has been given—can there be for not accepting the lowest tender?

Did you check anything on G. S. Wark and find they ever hadn't completed a job? Had they ever been involved in a bankruptcy? Have they ever had an overcharge? Nothing. You've checked, you've searched, you've found nothing. The reason is very simple. The reason is they wanted to give the job to their friend Clark, and this isn't the first time. There were two previous occasions and the other two firms were not G. S. Wark that were beaten out; the two previous occasions were Inspiration Ltd. and Selkirk Construction. They had been low bidders. What was wrong with them? Were they no good either? Give us some reason? Why is this the third occasion where this local firm is given the contract? I'll tell you the reason, because on that school board he

has got two of his people, and because the local people want it given to a local contractor. You heard that from the member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Havrot: Two out of 12.

Mr. Shulman: And that is what it is all about. There is going to be no difference in employment. Wark had guaranteed they would hire the same number of men; and this is supposed to be a province, not a series of little rotten boroughs. We are supposed to be trying to move ahead as a province. You shouldn't even be talking. You should be ashamed to talk that way in this House.

Mr. Havrot: I am not ashamed.

Mr. Yakabuski: Do your caucus realize that you referred to the towns in northern Ontario as rotten little boroughs?

Mr. Chairman: We should be discussing persons in the minister's department not some board of education.

Mr. Shulman: Well I'll come back to the minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Does the minister have any valid reason—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: What rotten boroughs?

Mr. Shulman: Well there are two of them and one of them is Renfrew South.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, through you to the minister, if he has any valid reason—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask through you to the minister, if he has any valid reason for not having—you won't get help from Bob Welch. It is too late; you are in too deep now. He would not have got in this mess, I will tell you that. Has the minister any valid reason for not giving or insisting on the low tender? Was any valid reason presented to the minister, other than the fact that they didn't like this guy because he was obnoxious? And he was obnoxious, because after he complained that after he had submitted the low tender, he didn't get the job? Was there any valid reason? Was there anything wrong with G. S. Wark and Company that you can get up and stand behind?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I indicated the reasons. I felt after discussion with the board that it was my feeling that there was a degree of animosity between the board and the low tender. It was such that if we insisted on it the school would not be built. I felt that the pressure in the community to build this French language school was so great that it should get on at once. That in this situation we should give approval if the board chose to go ahead with it. And at the same time, I said that we would only pay grant on the amount of the lowest tender which, in fact, means that the residents of New Liskeard and the Timiskaming area will be paying completely for the extra $7,000, and not the rest of the taxpayers of this province.

Mr. Shulman: The reason for this is very simple. I am not through with this yet. You are going to have to wait. The reason for this is very simple.—

Mr. Sargent: I don't care whether you are through or not.—

Mr. Shulman: The reason for the animosity is a very simple one.—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The hon. member for High Park is beginning to repeat himself. Now I have listened to this—

Mr. Shulman: I assure you I—

Mr. Chairman: I ask you not to be repetitious.

Mr. Shulman: I ask a question of the minister, two questions of the minister. First, can the minister explain the reasons for the animosity? Is it not true that the reason for the animosity was that the low bidder was so upset when he didn't receive the award that he was quite obnoxious to them? Now is that not the reason for the animosity?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer that.

Mr. Shulman: You should have looked into it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have been on a school board concerning awarding of tenders, and

when a low bidder has not been awarded the job for various reasons I have never found they came in with the kind of attitude that certainly seemed to have developed between the board and that person. I have given my reason, Mr. Chairman, and, as I say, I take full responsibility for it.

Mr. Shulman: My second question to the minister: Is the minister suggesting that if he had insisted that the low bidder be accepted in New Liskeard, that that board of education would have abdicated their responsibility and not built a school at all? Is that what he is saying about them?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I said that it was my impression, Mr. Chairman, that if we insisted that the low tender be given the contract, that the board might do that. This was certainly the very real situation that seemed to exist to me. And, based on that, I wanted to see the school go ahead.

Mr. Shulman: What an indictment that the minister has just given the school board up there. Why is the member for Timiskaming rising to defend them now? Just think of what he said, Mr. Chairman. He has said that they are so crass that if they can't give it to their friends, if they have to give it to the low bidder, they would rather not build a school at all. What kind of a school board is that? I can't really believe they are that bad. That is what the minister is saying now; and let that go on the record.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would suggest that the hon. member go up there and talk to his friends up there, like Arnold Peters, and ask them what kind of a school board it is.

Mr. Shulman: I would be delighted to go up there, and I am going up there within the next few weeks. But that is not the—

Mr. Yakabuski: You are not getting the support of your friends in the north. We are going to take seats from you there as a result of this.

Mr. Shulman: —not the mistake of Arnold Peters, and none of us are perfect. It does not excuse the minister from having made this gross error which is going to cost us too many millions of dollars in the future. And the people of New Liskeard are to pay a great proportion of it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member was perfect. But I guess maybe that is not so.

Mr. Shulman: Even I am not.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am glad that you admit it, because there are a lot of us certainly believe that you are anything but perfect.

I would just like to say that I will challenge the member, and let him show to me that contractors from all this province don't put in competitive bids in this section of northern Ontario. I venture to say that they will continue to bid just as they have been bidding before.

Mr. Shulman: The minister is showing that they are all fools and they are—

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Shulman: You are just wasting your money bidding, and even the minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Sargent: I am ashamed of you, Mr. Chairman, if you cannot run the House better than this. In that the—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! We will have to rise now in order to close the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves the committee of supply rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed. Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, because of the official visit to the Pickering nuclear plant tomorrow, there will be no meetings of committees. On Thursday we will proceed with the estimates that were before us this evening.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, continued 3007

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 3039

No. 77

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, June 1, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our visitors today in the east gallery are students from Herron Valley Jr. High School of Toronto; in the west gallery students from Glen Haven Sr. Public School of Mississauga; and in both galleries students from Ancaster Sr. Public School of Ancaster. At 3 o'clock in the east gallery we will be joined by students from Sunnyside Rd. Public School of Sudbury.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I hope it is a long one, while your colleagues gather.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Take lots of time so the whips can get to work.

Interjections by hon. members.

ACTION ON SECURITIES REPORTS

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs): The members of this House will probably be aware that a number of studies have been carried out in the securities field over the last number of years.

I would specifically mention the report of the Canadian Committee on Mutual Funds and Investment Contracts, which was a joint federal-provincial report released in December, 1969. It concluded that legislation in existence at that time was inadequate to safeguard the public interest and recommended that the mutual funds and their management be regulated.

The second study was a report of the committee of the Ontario Securities Commission on the problems of disclosure raised for investors by business combinations and private placements, better known as "The Merger Study," published in 1970, which recommended the concept of continuous disclosure or the "evergreen prospectus." The consensus of this report was that this would result in fewer restrictions and a greater liquidity in the marketplace, coupled with a high standard of investment information.

I am pleased to report to the House that I will be introducing for first reading today, an Act intituled the Securities Act 1972, which provides substantial amendments based on these two reports, and on the desire of this administration to have provincial uniformity in securities laws across Canada.

Under this legislation, mutual funds would for the first time be required to be registered as though they were a dealer. Through specific conditions of registration they would be required to grant specific rights to their security holders to approve changes in the management contract and investment policies, as well as more normal conditions requiring record keeping, bonding and insurance capital and audit fund. Management companies and contractual plan companies would also require registration and be subject to special conditions. New liabilities are imposed in relation to self-dealing.

As a result of the implementation of "The Merger Study" report, investors will have available to them continuous prospectus standards of disclosure, this being one of the most effective means of achieving and maintaining a high level of investor confidence in the capital markets of Canada. With this level of information becoming available to investors at all times, many of the restrictions built into the present Act for their protection would become redundant. For the "normal underwriting," a simple offering circular would replace the present prospectus. While there would be some additional burden on the issuer, it was agreed at the public and professional seminars which followed the publication of the merger report, that the freedom from restrictions in the marketplace, its consequent greater liquidity, and the ability of the issuer to get to the marketplace more quickly makes the system very desirable.

I should mention, Mr. Speaker, that the problem of continuous disclosure has been the subject of much discussion by such groups as the Canadian Bar Association and by a variety of other panels and seminars, including very close review by the provincial securities administrators throughout last year.

It is the intention of the government to introduce this bill for first reading at this

session and to allow an adequate time for submissions by all those interested or concerned, prior to the finalization of the Act. The resulting Act will be reintroduced in the House some time next session.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario has always led the way in the securities legislation field and I feel that this new Act is indicative of the type of leadership which has and will continue to be provided by this administration. By providing a continuous prospectus standard of investor disclosure, greater liquidity and flexibility in the marketplace, enhanced investor confidence, capital should be more readily available to Ontario and Canadian issuers.

It is our hope that after what we believe will be Canada-wide discussion on our particular legislation has taken place, the legislation in its final form will be adopted by almost all jurisdictions across Canada.

PROSPECTS FOR THE LAKE ONTARIO REGION

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have another statement. I am pleased to advise the House that my colleague, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), has today presented a further government report entitled "Prospects for the Lake Ontario Region." The Treasurer released this report this morning during a presentation to the Lake Ontario regional development council in Peterborough.

The booklet, which will be distributed to the hon. members, does not contain a plan for the development of this region, but rather it offers an analysis of the issues, trends, and conflicts now revolving as a natural consequence of the evolution taking place in the region's social, economic and physical resources. As well, the booklet contains brief descriptions of development concepts which, at least in theory, could be used to shape the region's growth in various ways. The government of Ontario is hopeful that this will initiate a process of citizen participation in the shaping of this region for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF CHAIRMAN OF OEC

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question posed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon), I believe on Monday or Tuesday, with respect to the position of the chairman of the Ontario Economic Council. Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret that I wish to inform the House that Dr. Gillies has tendered his resignation as chairman of the Ontario Economic Council.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Very proper thing to do.

Mr. Singer: He should have thought of that before.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I must say, Mr. Speaker, there was a discussion between Dr. Gillies and myself at the time he was contemplating becoming a candidate, and I personally felt that there would be no conflict of his duties there with respect to his candidacy until such time as the writ was issued. In the very recent discussions, I think it is fair to state that under the regulations there would be nothing to preclude Dr. Gillies from remaining as a member of the council. However, Dr. Gillies—in spite of the desire on the government's part to have him continue to play a very helpful role in the economic policies of this province—so that there would be no reflection on the council itself, has determined that he should resign not just as chairman but from the council as well.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all members of this House could join me in thanking Dr. Gillies for the very excellent contribution he has made, to wish him not only well, but success in his candidacy in the federal election and to—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Don't go that far.

Mr. Singer: Make the next government office available for frustrated Conservative politicians.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Don't push us.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and to say just how helpful it has been to have this association with the potential new Minister of Finance for Canada after the next election has been held.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now why don't they show a little gratuitous spirit for Dr. Gillies over there?

Mr. Lewis: No, no, no, gracious is the word.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Singer: The government got caught out on something it shouldn't have been doing and the Premier wants us to be gratuitous? Shame.

Mr. Lewis: Give it to him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member doesn't really mean that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'd like to ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, for some further information pertaining to his statement. I gather from his statement that he would agree with my interpretation that the regulations, in fact, would not permit Dr. Gillies to continue as chairman and that they're quite clear in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that there is perhaps some grey area but I have accepted the advice of those who have a very thorough knowledge of the law. Also there is Dr. Gillies' own desire that there be no controversy over this matter as far as his individual position as chairman is concerned, nor any reflection on the council; so that this was his determination as well.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: I wonder if the Premier would be able to add to the generosity of the spirit and the good will of his wishes to Dr. Gillies by indicating to the gentleman that if, in fact, he is not elected to the Parliament of Canada, we believe he would be an excellent chairman of the Economic Council of this province and that maybe we could keep that office open for him some time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in the unlikely—

Mr. Lewis: That's not a unanimous view, Mr. Premier. That is not a unanimous view.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's not a unanimous view, but I would say—

Mr. Lewis: It is not bad. Academic, but—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. I would say in the unlikely event that Dr. Gillies does not become the successful candidate in Don Valley, I certainly will accept the very sincere expression of opinion from the Leader of the Opposition that he should be persuaded to return as chairman of the Economic Council. I have also noted, Mr. Speaker, that that is not necessarily the view of the member for Scarborough West although, upon reflection, he may come to that point of view.

Mr. Lewis: You might make room for him in the Premier's office somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But as I say—

Mr. Lewis: He might do your correspondence.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I would say this to the member for Scarborough West, that if he had men of the talent of Dr. Gillies in his own office, he might have had some slight degree of success. Now it would have been slight, very minimal, nonetheless, it could not have been any worse than it was.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: We would have been pleased with a minimal—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

DISMISSAL OF DIRECTOR OF ROM

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Premier on another subject: Has he asked, either directly or through the Department of Colleges and Universities, for a report of the circumstances leading to the dismissal of the director of the Royal Ontario Museum, Peter Swann?

Second, is he concerned, as are many people, with the fact that this dismissal carried with it a 24-hour notice to get out of his office, which is surely rather a strange way for a person whose abilities have been so well recognized in the community, if not by the board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Kerr) can deal with this in more specific detail. I just had a very brief discussion with the minister.

As I understand it, the matter was, at least to a certain extent, brought to a head in the past few days more or less at the request of the director of the museum himself. I am not sure the question of whether he has 24 hours' notice to be out of his office, and so on, is the case, but the minister, perhaps, would have more precise information.

I do say this, Mr. Speaker, that having had some dealings with Mr. Swann over a period of years as director of the ROM, and I think this view is expressed by the chairman of the board itself, there is no question that Mr. Swann made a very distinct and very valuable contribution to the development of that institution.

As far as the government is concerned, there were a group of people who were given the responsibility for the administration of that institution, people of integrity, people of competence, who are acting in the best interests of that institution and they, of course, have made this particular determination. As it relates to any specific details, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition might wish to direct the questions to the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I do so wish. Would the minister give us a report of any information he might have; and is he going to ask for the kind of information that might give some further light to this situation? It is most distressing to many people in the community.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, there has been a statement issued by the chairman of the board of the museum indicating what has gone on, and giving the particulars of the meeting that was held yesterday. The hon. member mentioned that the director had only 24 hours' notice to get out. This is not quite true.

As the Prime Minister had indicated, Mr. Swann had a—

Mr. Singer: The Premier. He changed his title.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —contract that would expire the end of this year. Because of that, Mr. Swann wanted the board to advise him whether or not that contract would be renewed. And he wanted that information in May. The meeting was postponed, but a meeting was held last Monday at which time the board of trustees passed a resolution indicating that they would not renew his contract when it expired on Dec. 31 next.

Mr. Swann then, of course, apparently was asked to resign. At that point he indicated that he would like to finish out his term for a few months. But the board had decided at a subsequent meeting yesterday that he would have to resign this week or be dismissed.

As far as the reasons for this go, Mr. Speaker, the indication to me is—and there was some indication of that in today's Star—Mr. Swann was not getting along with the staff or members of the board. There was a certain amount of lack of leadership. There was controversy and turmoil. As a result of that, the board felt that the situation had become impossible. In the interest of the future of the museum, they decided to take the action they did take.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary question: Is the minister not concerned that perhaps over the years the membership of the board has begun to reflect a rather conservative attitude of those people concerned with museums, and even community affairs? That the board lacks a rather fresh and progressive approach to these matters? Is this not essentially the responsibility of the minister and the government, which makes the appointments to this board?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, naturally board members are appointed from time to time and I suppose their appointments reflect some background or interest in the particular institution to which they become affiliated. I have this concern, yes, and happily at least I have the opportunity at the end of this month to look at about four vacancies which will be filled. However, I must say—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Should be a few more vacancies.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —that I have absolute confidence in the chairman of that board. I've had the opportunity during the past three weeks to discuss the affairs of the museum and particularly the question of the director. I know that Mr. Swann himself has indicated to me that he has complete confidence in Mr. Torno the chairman and that he considers Mr. Torno his friend.

Mr. Singer: That was last week.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: In talking to Mr. Torno and having him indicate to me that he felt that Mr. Swann had been dealt with fairly and that the actions of the board were justified, I feel therefore under the circumstances that what the board has done probably is in order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Is the minister then implying that he is going to take no action, nor is he going to ask even for any further information on this matter, but regard it as a fait accompli?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I have asked for more information. The statement that I received just about a half hour ago from the chairman of the board is not, in my opinion, quite complete enough. I expect to get more information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Does the minister agree that it is a strange sequence of events in which one provincially-supported institution summarily dismisses the director and another one is about to confer an honorary degree upon him?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, I don't see any anomaly there.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: A supplementary: I wonder if the minister could clarify some of the things that didn't emerge too clearly from his statement. Was Mr. Swann dismissed for cause? If so, what was the cause? Or did he resign and, if so, when was his resignation submitted?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, my information is that Mr. Swann has not resigned. The latest information is that he refuses to resign. There is to be a meeting this afternoon at around 4 o'clock, at which time the board will meet to decide what to do.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, is Mr. Swann presently the director of the museum or has he been fired?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would say that, as at this moment, he is still director of the museum.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: Can the minister explain how it is that the director having requested that he serve out his term, or for at least a few more months, is then told that he is to be peremptorily dismissed within 24 hours? What does that tell the minister about the management of the board of the museum?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I believe the request by Mr. Swann to fill out, or complete at least part of the remainder of his term, was conveyed to one or two members of the board, and that request was subject to the approval of the board. A meeting was held later, at which time, apparently, that request was turned down.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the minister think that that is the way one handles the Director of the Royal Ontario Museum on the basis of what he knows of the institution? Let me put it another way, is the minister persuaded that the internal management and functioning of the museum are of a kind that it could not survive more than 24 hours with Peter Swann as director?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the museum could have survived at least another 24 hours with Mr. Swann as director. I think the important thing is to realize that the board—and this is indicated in the statement from the chairman—felt this was just prolonging something that would have to be settled within a couple of months; that there didn't seem to be any logic to the request that the matter be dealt with two or three months from now; that the situation apparently had reached such an impasse and was such with the staff, and particularly with the curatorial staff, that it was felt that the decison should be made now.

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister thought of establishing the board as a permanent exhibit in the museum—in the prepaleolithic period?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A lot of dinosaurs in that museum, aren't there?

Mr. Speaker: Order. There have already been several supplementaries, which is quite sufficient. Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition any further questions? There have been sufficient supplementaries.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No further questions.

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT TASK FORCE

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, if I could: Can the Premier explain how the terms of reference of the new task force for the Niagara Escarpment differ fundamentally from the terms of reference within which Professor Gertler operated five years ago?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, without a very careful analysis of the former terms of reference for Professor Gertler in his initial report, I couldn't answer that as precisely as I would like. I would think there is one distinguishing factor, that is, that this task force is charged with the responsibility of making recommendations as to how the government by way of policy might deal with some of the areas that were contained in the Gertler report, not for purposes of acquisition but whether they should be dealt with by way of zoning, whether there should be restricted use. In other words, what should be the policy as it relates to a large portion

of the lands that were not recommended for acquisition in the Gertler report.

This would probably be one distinguishing characteristic. I shall check the original terms of reference and get further information for the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the Premier not concerned that this is yet another extraordinary delay in the episode of trying to acquire the Niagara Escarpment? Has he thought of a freeze as he did with North Pickering in order to preserve the escarpment for future purchase?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of the lands that were recommended directly for acquisition by Gertler, my recollection is there have been very few, if any, plans of subdivision approved within those specific areas. We are dealing to a large extent with that substantial acreage that was referred to in the Gertler report as recommended for, say, recreational use, open space, or what have you, and there is no delay whatsoever. It is not a prolonging of the situation but, with great respect, there weren't precise recommendations in the Gertler report as to how or what the rules or policies should be with respect to the acreage outside the actual acquisition.

Mr. Lewis: By way of last supplementary: As I understand it, 90,000 acres of total or selective acquisition was suggested, of which 30,000 has been acquired thus far. Can the Premier at some time in the next few days—I think the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) has assembled it—show us finally how the land which has so far been acquired on the escarpment compares precisely with the land which in his report Gertler recommended be acquired.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't undertake to have that within the next two or three days. I am not sure just what information the Minister of Natural Resources is accumulating as to the exact boundaries of the land in the Gertler report and what the government has been acquiring.

I would only make this observation. It could quite conceivably be that we will acquire some lands which were not recommended for acquisition within the Gertler report. It may be that in the judgement of the government there are some lands that he did recommend we acquire which, for good reason, we will not acquire. I am not going to suggest to you that the boundaries will be identical.

There will be no difficulty, certainly in determining the amount of acreage that has been acquired. I think the minister will be in a position to give some indication as to the programme and the timing for the acquisition of a substantial increase in that amount of acreage. This, I will discuss with the minister and make available to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

PROPOSED TAKE-OVER OF TORONTO COMPANY

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Industry and Tourism, if I could. Is he aware that Jespersen-Kay Systems Ltd. of Toronto, one of whose major shareholders at least is resident in London, Ont., is in the process of arranging a takeover of their company by an entirely American-owned firm for the purpose of financial viability? Has the minister investigated the situation?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I know the company. I was not aware of this development. I will be glad to look into the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Well, they will hold.

Mr. Speaker: All right, the hon. Minister of Revenue has the answer to a question previously asked.

FIRE IN OHC BUILDING

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Don Mills (Mr. Trimbrell) asked me a series of questions concerning OHC involvement in an apartment fire on the seventh floor of 90 Parma Court in the borough of North York on May 19, 1972.

He asked, as he put it, if I was aware that OHC maintenance staff had turned off the water supply to all the hoses in the building. Ontario Housing Corp. most certainly did not turn off the water supply. The building in question is six years old and at the time of construction fulfilled all fire regulations. However, since the structure is seven stories high, the municipal water pressure was not sufficient at the time to adequately push water to the seventh floor. Water pressure varies according to demands made upon water usage

by garden hoses and industries using great amounts of water.

To overcome this deficiency the fire department quickly hooked up a pumper to a siamese coupling on the outside of the building, immediately providing the additional pressure required. I am advised, also, that it is standard operating procedure by the fire department to hook a building coupling to the pumper to guarantee water pressure.

This building, like all others, receives regular fire department inspections. I should also advise the hon. member that a private firm engaged by OHC also checks equipment and emergency fire fighting supplies. The last such inspection was on April 14 of this year. Arrangements were made by OHC staff for the occupants of the apartment, a mother and two sons, to reside temporarily with a daughter who was a tenant at another OHC development.

OHC, through its community relations officer, co-ordinated material assistance for the family from a number of agencies. The North York Fire Department gave the tenant $50 out of its emergency fund. The Red Cross provided clothing vouchers; the Scott Mission and the Salvation Army will supply furniture and the Ministry of Community and Social Services will also assist with furniture and will provide other needs. The local tenants' association provided clothing and a drive for cash was organized at the development.

I want to take this opportunity of thanking all these organizations and public spirited citizens for their concern and assistance. Renovation work has begun and the apartment should be ready for occupancy in about a week. The corridor has been repainted and minor smoke and water damage to adjacent units has been attended to.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Community and Social Services also has the answer to a question.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, this is in reply to a question posed last week by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to a news story in the Toronto Star concerning the alleged financial involvement of two senior civil servants in a home for the care of children.

A full investigation is now under way and when it is concluded I will make a further report to the House. An interim unaudited financial statement has been made available to me and I have asked that the report of the investigation include an audited statement, with details of any financial transactions relevant to the involvement of public servants. The statement I am giving today is based on information available to date. I am not able at this time to reach any final conclusions about this matter.

The two persons referred to in the Toronto Star story are Dr. Sherwood Appleton and Mr. Edward Magder. Dr. Appleton is a psychiatrist who has been a consultant with the Ministry of Health and our own ministry. He is not a public servant. Mr. Magder is the director of our children's and youth institutions branch.

The group homes at 69 Sussex Ave. and 171 Robert St. were operated by a corporation known as Investments Ltd. that was incorporated under the Business Corporations Act in October, 1971. Dr. Appleton is a director and a shareholder in this corporation. Mr. Magder informs me that he is neither a director nor a shareholder in the corporation.

The information available to us as filed under the Corporations Information Act confirms this statement. Dr. Appleton and Mr. Magder were partners in the ownership of two houses used by the corporation to conduct a project for the care of children. It appears at this time that Mr. Magder's financial involvement was as a landlord to the corporation.

The complete audit to which I referred earlier will reveal whether or not any personal financial advantage was taken of this arrangement. The interim unaudited statement which has been submitted dealing with the partnership for the ownership of the houses indicates that no personal, financial advantage resulted for Mr. Magder in his role as landlord.

The two homes were used principally by the Catholic Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto and the Metropolitan Toronto Children's Aid Society. In addition, one child each was placed by the Jewish Family and Child Service, by the Children's Aid Society of Essex county and the Children's Aid Society of Thunder Bay.

As the members will be aware, cost-sharing arrangements between Children's Aid Societies in the province is that payments to Children's Aid Societies are made on the basis of approved budgets. The selection of suitable institutions, foster homes and group homes for the placement of children is left to the discretion of the local societies.

In cases such as this there is therefore no direct transfer of funds from the province to the institution and the payment of per diem rates for children cared for is made by the Children's Aid Society to the group home or institution. Under provincial legislation relating to homes for children, homes operated by private non-profit corporations may be approved under the Children's Institutions Act, or the Charitable Institutions Act, or the Homes for Retarded Persons Act. Under this legislation, capital and operating grants are available and certain standards of programmes and facilities are required.

Corporations such as Investments Ltd. are not eligible for approval under these three Acts and are therefore not eligible for a direct provincial subsidy.

All other institutions or boarding homes for the group care of children, which are caring for five or more children up to the age of 18, must be registered under the Children's Boarding Homes Act. There is no provision under this Act for the payment of provincial subsidies to homes or institutions. The main purpose of the Children's Boarding Homes Act is to maintain certain standards relating to fire protection, physical care and accommodation, qualifications for staff and suitable programmes and services.

The question of the registration of the homes operated by this corporation was raised in the Toronto Star article. Mr. Magder informs me that these homes were not registered under the Children's Boarding Homes Act. I understand from him that during the period of approximately six months when the project was in operation the homes fell well within the requirement for registration for certain periods of time as follows: For three weeks in December, 1971 pending the opening of the second house; for 10 days in January, 1972; and for 10 days in February, 1972.

These are relatively brief periods of time and such occurrences are not, I understand, unusual when homes are being established. The programmes in both homes were terminated as of May 19, 1972, and all children had been relocated by the Children's Aid Society. I am informed by Mr. Magder that the two houses are being placed on the market for sale.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out with respect to the hon. minister that the answer just given does constitute a little more than a brief reply to a question. It properly should have been brought in under statements by the ministry as is provided for under our standing orders. The answer was about twice as long as it should have been. I will, therefore, add three minutes to the question period.

The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, who has been in and out of his seat. and if I could reserve a spot when he comes back, I would like to ask him a question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As long as you are reserving a spot over there.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Downsview finished?

Mr. Singer: Well, I am waiting for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, who bounces in and out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

POLLUTION MONITORING INSTRUMENTS

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Colleges and Universities. The minister will recall that at a meeting on Hamilton's Beach Blvd. during the election campaign last September, he promised the citizens' committee that there would be an air pollution monitoring instrument placed at the beach in the near future; secondly, he promised that there would be an engineering survey made to determine the feasibility of the installation of sewers—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a statement or a question?

Mr. Gisborn: —in that portion of—

Mr. Speaker: I don't detect a question so far.

Mr. Lewis: Listen carefully, here it is.

Mr. Gisborn: —Hamilton Beach. Does the minister recollect the promises and would he refer the promises to the present Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) so that he, in his position, can take action on the former minister's promises?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Of course, if I said no, that would be the end of it.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The minister made promises all over Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Can you swim in Hamilton Bay?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —I recall that meeting at Hamilton Beach—

Mr. Martel: In Sudbury, too.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —during the election campaign, and there was a big crowd there, and the candidate for the New Democratic Party for Hamilton East attended that meeting, and we welcomed him there. As a matter of fact, he sat up front and he asked too many questions, I might say.

Mr. Lewis: Actually he stood on the beach and you stood on the water.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: But regarding the air pollution monitoring instrument, I can recall saying that the next instrument that was to be put in Hamilton to measure the air pollution index in that city would be located on the beach strip. Now, I am not sure that there has been an additional monitoring device installed there or not, but I would be happy to talk to the Minister of the Environment about it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As soon as he gets back from France.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Now, regarding sewers, that was the other item I can recall that was discussed and that, really, was the main reason for the meeting. There was to be a joint study between the province and the city as to the feasibility of putting in sanitary sewers on the beach strip. As a matter of fact, I thought that had been pretty well along the way, shall we say, by March 1, or April 1—I am sorry, Feb. 1. I thought some progress had been made.

Mr. Singer: First of something.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Pardon?

Mr. Gisborn: That was canned at the same time the minister was.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, I can recall that early in January—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about the minister's promises with the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —early in January, Mr. Speaker, I had a report from OWRC, as a matter of fact, I believe as a result of a request from the alderman at that point, I forget his name, Reg Wheeler, who was wondering what was going on, and it was my impression at that time that the study would be undertaken immediately. I will check into that as well if you like.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: At the same time the minister is answering, can he indicate what has happened to the second monitor he promised for the Sudbury area during the same series of meetings some six months ago?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, we have trouble with those monitors in the Sudbury area; they keep disappearing.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): You can't find them for the fumes!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

INTERPRETATION OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Would he advise us why the Superintendent of Insurance, by a circular letter dated Feb. 2, 1972, would take it upon himself to advise the chief executive officers of all insurers transacting automobile insurance in Ontario as to how they should interpret a statute? Would the minister further advise us why the Superintendent of Insurance would have the temerity to suggest that it was of vital importance that the implementation of his programme proceed on an orderly basis without the raising of issues which would confuse or detract from its purpose?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, in replying to the member for Downsview I think I will have to send him a revised edition of the ministries. My ministry is now known as Consumer and Commercial Relations.

In answer to his question, I would suggest to him that the problem which had to be rectified by that letter—and I am not aware of that letter—was probably the problem that arose at the end of January, a situation of which I informed the hon. member in the discussion of the bill that is currently on the floor—and probably because a lot of people did not read the words of clarification that were given in that discussion of June 14, 1971, by one of my predecessors.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He might have just read the bill.

Mr. Singer: By way of a supplementary, would the minister not agree that once this Legislature has passed a statute it doesn't lie within the control of any civil servant to say how it should be interpreted and to issue directives to an important industry or to anybody else?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Inasmuch as I wasn't the minister at that particular time I am not prepared to make a comment on what transpired, but I would doubt the authenticity of what the hon. member has just said.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister is doubting the authenticity of the two parts I quoted from the letter, let him consult his own official. If the hon. minister believes that civil servants should interpret statutes and issue authoritative statements, then I ask the minister to tell us at what point the statute-making process is significant and whether he thinks that it is useful at all if it is going to be changed from the actual English wording in the statute by letters written by civil servants?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Obviously there was misinterpretation, and I think it would be done for clarification. I would not agree with the hon. member that it was a directive until I see what transpired.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

PRO-CON CONSOLIDATED WAREHOUSING

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Right!

Mr. Bounsall: Would the minister determine whether Pro-Con Consolidated Warehousing, a company wholly owned by Richard Grange, is listed, or has ever been listed, as a subsidy of Cartwright Cartage Ltd.?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think the hon. member will realize that I don't have that information with me, but I will acquire it for him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Solicitor General has the answer to a question asked previously.

FIRE REGULATIONS FOR TREATMENT CENTRES

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, on May 25 the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) asked the question:

> When does the minister propose to change the fire regulations for family type home treatment centres for the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed, so that they require no special protection features beyond that of a normal home, as has been requested, I understand, by the Minister of Health?

Answer: Homes for retarded persons are governed under the provisions of the Homes for Retarded Persons Act, which is administered by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. The fire marshal's involvement in this kind of programme is to carry out the wishes of the responsible ministry. The regulations relating to fire protection in such homes do not appear to be stringent. The fire marshal will be pleased to discuss any changes in these regulations with the ministry which is responsible for this programme.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A supplementary: Is the minister aware, as indicated in a letter I sent to him yesterday, that the actual additional cost to the five homes in Markham which are affected was $35,000, an amount which I would consider more than immaterial?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, it so happens that I had the opportunity of being the Minister of Social and Family Services. When the thought of fire striking one of the homes for which I had the responsibility entered my mind—as it did continuously—cost figures invariably took second place. I would not want to take the responsibility for a home going up in flames with the attendant loss of life and injury if there had been some lessening of the standard of fire protection, if the fire marshal in examining—

Mr. Lewis: Those standards are used to harass, not to assist.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —the institutions. Ontario has been extremely fortunate, either by good fortune or by good management, to have escaped the tragedies that have befallen other jurisdictions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary: Since the minister is so aware of the safety of all residents of Ontario, does he envisage the fire marshal changing regulations for all homes to these levels so as not to set apart homes for these youngsters from other homes in the area?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will agree that it is impossible and really not feasible nor proper to identify the structure of or the care for every particular kind of facility according to one model. Different types of persons require different types of care and treatment. This, I think, is what the fire marshal has in mind.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. Lewis: The minister's eyes are never closed!

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): I would like to ask a question of the Premier.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Just look under the bed!

Mr. Spence: I would like to ask a question of the Premier of the province.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): He's not interested, not interested.

Mr. Spence: Could the Premier inform me if there is space available for students who have not secured summer employment yet in any of the student summer employment programmes that have been announced by the different departments of the government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I shall inquire for the hon. member. I would doubt if there are many spots left. There were many thousands of applications to the various government programmes. The response from the students in this province was very encouraging.

If the hon. member perhaps could be more definitive as to who, where, how many and what sort of programmes they are interested in, I certainly should make an effort. I think, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the applications have exceeded the number of places for students, but I'll certainly look into it for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

APPOINTMENT OF CORONER FOR NIPIGON AREA

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I have a question of the Solicitor General. Has the Solicitor General read a report in one of the northern newspapers saying that a Dr. W. Warkentin has been appointed coroner for the Nipigon area and that this was confirmed to the local Conservative association on Friday? How long is this minister going to resort to cheap political stunts, rather than working through a local member to make these announcements?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: How long is the local member going to use those things for cheap political stunts?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member—

Mr. Lewis: Here it comes.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —has had the habit for years of jumping to conclusions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would ask him, what would ever lead him to believe that I would do the kind of thing he asked in the last question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister saying that a copy of this information was delivered to my office and through some inability of the postal service, I did not receive it? Is that what he is trying to say?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, Mr. Speaker, that isn't what I tried to convey.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Revenue has the answer to a question.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask how the minster explains the public approval and announcement sought by a local Conservative association, rather than by contact with the member? How does he explain that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't know what the hon. member means when he says, "rather

than by contact with the hon. member." May I say, Mr. Speaker, that in the years that I have been in this chamber and holding portfolio, I have conveyed far more information to members of the opposition than they have ever conveyed to me.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: When are those guys over there going to stop their cheap political stunts?

Mr. Lewis: I consider the question answered.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it may be that the local members should keep in contact with the local PC association and find out how these things happen.

An hon. member: A good idea.

Mr. Ruston: You would find out what is going on.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister aware that the local Conservative association actually writes letters to me, with copies to the Queen, rather than sending them to ministers of the Crown?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION IN RENFREW COUNTY PROJECT

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, I have a question—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: And what does the Queen do?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Yakabuski: I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Her eye is never closed.

Mr. Yakabuski: The county of Renfrew development branch is planning on putting together a very attractive entrance complex to that county in the vicinity of Arnprior. Will the Ministry of Industry and Tourism consider participating in the operation of this entrance and display?

Mr. Cassidy: Will the member participate in this complex?

Hon. Mr. White: I believe the member for Renfrew South headed a small delegation to see me about 10 days ago, and I must say I was tremendously impressed by the plans drawn up by the Renfrew county development branch, which I will say—

Mr. Singer: Oh, yes!

Mr. Cassidy: It will look good in the record!

Hon. Mr. White: —are the most aggressive and progressive of any such region I've seen in the several months of my present responsibilities.

Mr. Cassidy: Not to judge by their member.

Hon. Mr. White: They are intending to have a combined trade and tourism centre, and I have conferred with my officials and have decided that in this new centre, as part of the decentralization of this new ministry, we will place two tourism officers, one trade officer and perhaps one ODC officer, if the bill which is before the House is passed and if the resources can be found in addition to two or three clerk-stenographers.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Seven appointments for the member for Renfrew South!

Mr. Lewis: All of them through the local PC association.

Hon. Mr. White: I have also decided that we shall participate in the central display area, which is part of the undertaking, once again subject to the negotiations to be carried out on our behalf by the Ministry of Government Services. So we will be participating very fully as part of our decentralization—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The member for Renfrew South can smile now.

Hon. Mr. White: —and as a consequence of the good work being done by the development branch of Renfrew county.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And the local member.

Mr. Martel: Was that planted?

Mr. Lewis: What about the local member?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Revenue has an answer to a previous question.

ROLE OF MUNICIPALITIES IN OHC DEVELOPMENTS

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Windsor West asked me on May 8 about the city's involvement in the sale of public housing units in Bridgeview Court to tenants.

OHC is not required, by any legal agreement, to consult Windsor, or secure its approval, for the sale of units or their conversion to rent-geared-to-income scale. However, OHC consults with a municipality before any steps are taken by the corporation regarding the management of units within its boundaries.

All public housing comes under a tripartite agreement, with the city sharing in any deficit to the extent of 7.5 per cent. OHC, therefore, in common with the practice throughout the province, sought a similar agreement with Windsor.

Mr. Bounsall: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, this bill simply provides the legislative vehicle by which we can make these guaranteed loans for the purchase of beef-breeding females, for the purchase of dairy cows and dairy heifers, as well as the acquisition of industrial milk marketing sharing quotas.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That'll shake the rats out of the rafters.

REVISED STATUTES OF ONTARIO, 1970

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to confirm the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1970.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

REVISED REGULATIONS OF ONTARIO, 1970

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to confirm the Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1970.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the first bill is to confirm the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1970, as printed by the Queen's Printer and Publisher, and the second one is to confirm the Revised Regulations as printed and published by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. Cassidy: What does "confirming" mean?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Re-enact.

SECURITIES ACT, 1972

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves first reading of bill intituled, The Securities Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 21st order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. Hodgson in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (*continued*)

On vote 2201:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2201, item 4, carried?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): One, 2 and 3 not carried.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Let's just assume that they are not carried, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: What are we on—1, 2 and 3?

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Two and 3.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It didn't work, Bill.

An hon. member: A good try; wasn't it?

Mr. Laughren: The minister has released a statement regarding the grants in aid for educational research. I noticed in perusing the grants that had been given out—the

successful submissions—that there is a rather obvious lack in the allocation of funds for investigating how to teach English as a second language.

I believe at the present time that there are about 35,000 students in the province taking English as a second language. With the growth of the French-language secondary schools, and all the other recommendations of the Symons report, this number is certainly going to grow; and probably significantly. I am wondering if he could explain to us why there have not been more funds available for this kind of research. I know that there have been submissions made to your ministry to provide funds for this.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Well, Mr. Chairman, I think as the hon. member is aware from the statement and the accompanying list, these were grants and aid that we provide under this programme to people who have planned research on their own and submitted it to us. I think there were well over 100 submitted. Now, I haven't got the list here. I can't recall whether any were submitted in that particular area that you have mentioned: teaching of English as a second language. This must indicate that those people were not interested in doing research in that area.

But we still have that large vote in these estimates of over $1 million for contractual research, which we will do and which we will be allocating under our committee. As I mentioned the other night, this can be considered for contractual research that we would undertake.

Now, I understand that there is also a committee on English as a second language. A curriculum committee is now meeting to also consider this whole particular problem. They, of course, will be giving much attention to the teaching of English as a second language.

But if it is necessary for research to be done on this, it can be done through our other fund, the contractual research fund. We haven't made the indication of what the areas of study will be in this area for this year yet. I think I indicated the other night that in about three or four weeks we will make a statement to the House about what was going to be done; where that money would be allocated.

Mr. Laughren: I know I don't know the intricate details of your grant system, but you haven't answered, at least to my satisfaction, the reasons why there would not be substantial funds devoted to this in your release; an indication as to where your funds have gone. I am sure you must admit that the growth of English as a second language is going to be significant in the years ahead.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, as I say to the hon. member, this money, about $900,000 here, is money we give to assist people who want to conduct research. The initiative for this research is on the part of the person applying for the funds. Now, I asked the hon. member if he knows of some people who applied, but did not get assistance under this programme? I didn't make the selections. They were made by a committee headed by a man from Queen's University. The selection was based on the quality of research and factors such as that. Does the hon. member know of someone who made application for a research grant under this programme for that particular purpose and didn't get it?

Mr. Laughren: Yes, I do, but I didn't want to get into the specifics. I wanted some kind of justification on your part as to why funds have not been allocated to this. Saying, "Yes, I know somebody who made a submission and was refused," makes it look as though I'm just going to bat for some one individual that I happen to know, and that's not what is at stake here. The question here is the fact that there are no grants in here for the teaching of English as a second language.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am afraid perhaps the hon. member doesn't understand how our process works. In this particular instance, based on the quality of research and on the projects submitted, we give grants in aid. Now if there was a particular project submitted on teaching of English as a second language, I'd have to find out why the committee rejected it. I don't know why, but in their wisdom they must have decided to reject it.

The rejecting or accepting of the project under this vote is not necessarily dependent upon the priority that we would attach to that. It's based on the kind of research, the quality of research and what end the researcher is hoping to attain. But, under our other grant, which is contractual research, that's where we do establish the priorities, and if we in the department feel that there is a priority in doing research on the teaching of English as a second language, we will undertake then to ask people to put forward projects on this particular research area and then we will fund those projects. That, as I

say, is the process we're going through now, and in about three or four weeks we'll announce the kind of contractual research that we're going to undertake.

Mr. Chairman: Items 1, 2, 3 carried? The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister a question concerning the grants. Certain institutions or organizations such as the Ontario Association for Children with Learning Disabilities—and I have another one here, the Association for the Development of Human Potential—are attempting to get established because of certain difficulties that the concerned members have, primarily with their own children. I don't know if this would be the appropriate place to ask the minister if his department has considered grants, educational type of grants, to associations like that so that they themselves could further their own organization and assist the whole structure?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, organizations such as that would make application to us under the miscellaneous grant item here. That's where we supply grants to groups in the general education field.

Mr. B. Newman: All right, then this would not come under item—

Hon. Mr. Wells: This is for very specific research projects—

Mr. B. Newman: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —that are submitted in a certain manner—

Mr. B. Newman: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —and with objectives and so forth, either by universities, OISE or school boards or organizations.

Mr. B. Newman: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Now if one of those associations had a specific research project that they wanted to undertake, say the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities, and they had a person going to work for them to do that particular project and they worked it out and submitted that, they could submit it under this item as a research project. But that would have to be a specially identified research project, not just money to the association in order to seed it and help it develop and carry on its work.

Mr. B. Newman: Then, Mr. Chairman, I am right on in my suggestion originally, when I referred to the Association for the Development of Human Potential, who are interested, or have been interested in the past, in a method of simply teaching or training the youngster to move, to walk; they call their system "patterning." I'm not completely familiar with the approach that they do use, but they have undertaken projects, I would assume, in more communities than simply the city of Windsor. Would there be grants available to them then under this vote, rather than under a succeeding vote?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't know enough about the group, Mr. Chairman, to say for sure. It could be that if it was a bona fide research project there could be a possibility of a grant here. It could be that they'd be better to apply under miscellaneous grants, but I'd have to look at the group and see exactly what they planned.

Mr. B. Newman: I hesitate to bring it up, Mr. Chairman, but the organization has been in touch with the minister's department. In fact, they wrote originally on December 6, and then on May 9 they wrote a second time. Rather than discuss it on the floor of the Legislature, I wish the minister's department would look into the request of the Association for the Development of the Human Potential and, if at all possible, Mr. Chairman, do everything it can for them. They are doing a real service to the young and it could be the type of a project that could be duplicated in other areas and a real service to the youngsters.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask under item 3, ministry business administration, what steps the minister has taken to tighten up the procedures by which expenditures in his department are authorized.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of very much concern to me, of course. I have been following the proceedings of the public accounts committee and I have at this point indicated and taken certain steps to indicate that everything possible must be done in our ministry to assure that we do have a system that will prevent anything that might have happened in the past; such as procedures or handling of invoices that were not perhaps in accord with the established procedures of the government or the established ground rules of the government. We are determined that all things will be done

in this ministry to assure that this cannot happen again.

We are in the process of organizing for—and I'm not an accountant, I have become familiar with these terms; it's the post-audit procedure, is that not right?—the post-audit procedure so that we will be able to switch our ministry over on a proper basis to post-audit some time later in this year. Apart from that, I have indicated to the deputy minister and he has indicated to the people in our ministry that they are to prepare procedures and use outside management consultant firms if necessary to enable us to do this later in the year and to enable us to establish the procedures that will make sure everything is handled in the proper manner.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may just follow up briefly on the minister's reply.

Does the minister accept—as I'm sure he does—that in the sense of responsible government, the minister is responsible, and does he clearly indicate to the members of the civil service in his department that when they certify an invoice with respect to matters required by the Financial Administration Act of the Province of Ontario that they are "certified," if I may use that term, in quotes, on behalf of the minister and that the responsibility to the Legislature of Ontario under our system of responsibility is vested in the minister; that, regardless of all the expertise outside experts can give, any audit system depends upon the integrity of those who make certificates as to the multitude of detailed accounting matters which fall under the purview of the ministry and that that certificate is a matter to which they are, in substance, swearing as to its accuracy with respect to content, date, delivery of items, and other related matters?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have so indicated. I certainly feel very strongly about this. I recognize it is my responsibility, as minister responsible to this Legislature, to assure that all the members of the ministry, members of the civil service, who authorize accounts on my behalf are doing this in this particular manner and that they must realize that it's not a routine thing, but something that must be done with great care and it must be done accurately and that when they sign their name they have to be sure that they are signing it to something that they can substantiate and verify.

I have indicated my concern and my wishes in this matter to the deputy minister and he has circulated a memo quoting from the various Audit Acts and so forth and we have stressed with everyone in our ministry now that this is the procedure that is to be followed. No one is to take masses of invoices, no matter what they are for, and sit there and sign their names on them. They are to be very conscious that this is a special function that they have of authorizing invoices and it is an important one. They must do it in a proper manner and they must be conscious of what they are signing.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the minister allow us to see a copy of that memorandum?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We will get copies.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, would the minister describe something a little more about the programme of cultural exchange? It this school-to-school programmes that they have had in the past years with other countries or is this something within the province itself? They total $336,000.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, this is the programme that is run by David Steinauer and his branch. The money is used to transport students to other countries to foster an interest in culture. Part of the money in this vote is given to the Folk Arts Council of Ontario, which makes grants, on our behalf, to certain of the ethnic groups in the province to assist them in their programme.

The hon. member for Port Arthur asked me to give a complete breakdown. That was to be here. Perhaps I can give you that complete breakdown in a few minutes. It was prepared and somehow it has been misplaced. I will have it for you in a minute.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, in what way is this programme co-ordinated then with the Ministry of Community and Social Services programme, the community programme within that department? In what way is this co-ordinated with that programme, if you are talking about cultural exchange programmes?

Can you give us more details of what is in store for this coming year for this vote?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I guess the hon. member is referring to the money that is in the community services programme that is given to community groups and groups like this?

Mr. Deacon: The Heritage Ontario type.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The Heritage Ontario type. The grants under the cultural exchange programme are slightly different. They are grants perhaps to a choir or a group to travel to Quebec or to assist them to travel to Europe under various programmes, and things like this. The co-ordination will come through our membership on the social development policy committee. We are working out arrangements in these particular areas, so that we have co-ordination in the kind of grants that we give and the organizations to which we give assistance and grants and to which other departments do. We are just now working out forms, so that we will know; so there will be co-ordination; so that there won't be duplication of grants, and so that people who need assistance will know where they can go to get the kind of assistance to help them.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if perhaps these grants were really ones to subsidize travel to other countries by whatever groups there are. I would be interested in finding out on what basis these decisions are made; who is to go; how they are selected and what type of trips they make. I thought perhaps the community work, that is, the cultural encouragement within the communities, would be under the other departments rather than this particular vote.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Culture covers a great and broad area, Mr. Chairman. It may be that in this area we are covering a certain area of culture which is perhaps apart from what the community grants programme in their department is covering.

As I say, if there are indications that the grants and the money are misplaced in our area and should be in theirs, this is exactly what our social policy development committee is for, to try to make sure that they are brought into the right area and that there is no duplication.

Mr. Deacon: Could you give us some details about what is envisaged for this year in the way of travel, since you surely have some ideas?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can't tell you this year, because the vote is just here and we haven't indicated yet.

Mr. Deacon: Could you give us some details of the programme?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think the best I can do, Mr. Chairman, is to give you an example of the spending that we did last year, and that is an indication.

Ontario to Quebec: Educational, French summer school, Compton, Que., 11 bursaries at $200 for students enrolled at the school; one graduate from each of the colleges of education and teachers' colleges; University of Guelph—University of Sherbrooke exchange of four students; Les Jeunesses Musicales du Canada, 12 bursaries to young Ontarians to assist with the cost of attending the Mount Orford music camp; University of Toronto, to assist 50 students at the College of Education with the cost of attendance at the Trois-Pistoles School of the course on culture and society; York University, to assist six students in administrative studies to study at Laval University for one year.

In the the cultural field—and these are perhaps more what the hon. member was thinking about—the St. Mary's CHI-RHO Youth Corps, to assist with the cost of an exchange with Quebec youth, $100; Big Brothers of Metropolitan Toronto, to assist with the cost of travel for a group of mothers on a trip to Quebec—it numbered 15 and the cost was $1,900; to assist with the travel cost of 40 boys to Quebec; New Toronto Secondary School, to assist with the travel cost incurred in the implementation of an exchange project with a community college in Sherbrooke, Que.; Burlington Central High School, to assist in an exchange involving 33 students from Ontario with the Ecole de Sacré-Coeur of Windsor, Que.

I could go on. There are pages and pages of them here, Mr. Chairman. There are then—

Mr. Deacon: It is largely Quebec and Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is what I was going to say; that is the Quebec-Ontario part. Then there is Ontario to France: Cultural, experiment in international living; a contribution to travel scholarships for students participating in youth ambassador and exchange programmes. Part of this grant was used for exchanges with France: $7,000; the Centre des Jeunes de Sudbury, to assist with the travel costs of 13 young dancers known as Les Folkloristes Ontariennes, to travel to France, Switzerland and Italy, to give performances.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You're taking French lessons from Mr. Diefenbaker?

Hon. Mr. Wells: These are basically Ontario to France exchanges and Ontario to Quebec.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Yes, I just wanted to comment that I think, as a matter of fact, I was personally a beneficiary of that particular programme, now that you outline it, about four or five years ago. There was an exchange of young directors from Quebec and Europe to tour Ontario theatres. It seems to me it was a fairly worthwhile programme.

I wanted to get into the grants in this programme. A number of them that you just mentioned, Mr. Minister, were to the community colleges and to post-secondary level. I assume that in the coming year with the transfer of the responsibility of community colleges to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities you would be concentrating more on secondary exchange, or is this just a separate programme that covers all of these?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Actually, we haven't made that differentiation in the cultural exchange. We still have the whole cultural exchange vote here. We didn't put any of it in Colleges and Universities and I think for the time being we'll leave it here and still assist post-secondary students in this vote.

Mr. Chairman: Are items 1, 2 and 3 carried?

On item 4, data processing. The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, to what extent is the data processing now being accepted by the schools not just for timeables but for storing information for use by various school boards to compare operating costs, results and things like that; so that it's a storage of data that is available to various boards from maybe a central storage point in the Department of Education? It seems to me important that we make use of this modern form of storage of information so that it's available and you can get some comparative performance data that can be used not only by the department in its performance programme budgeting, but also by the various boards of education in comparing results. I ask this because of the study that was made I think about 1964, "Comparisons of School Boards' Performance in the Metropolitan Toronto Area." At the time there were 13 municipalities. The study was done by the Bureau of Municipal Research.

Although the guidelines and the basis of the evaluation were very rough, it showed that the most money being spent per student was by Forest Hill, and it had the best results on the basis of the comparison that was used, but the lowest amount spent by any of the 13 municipalities was Scarborough, yet it came out with the second best results. Now this type of evaluation, even though it is rough now, if it is improved by making use of the data centre, could be a very important tool available to the boards of education to compare costs and see what sort of results are coming out of various boards as a result of different programmes they are introducing. I would ask the minister what is being done in the use of this utilization of the data processing centre, other than say for timetables and that sort of thing?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the data processing equipment is being used by ourselves as an in-house operation for all our grants, and as such it has in it a lot of the statistical information and financial information from the school boards, but it isn't basically being used by school boards for their own accounting procedures. It is being used, as the member has stated, for the timetabling by about 250 secondary schools. It is being used on a—

Mr. Deacon: How many? I would like to know how many there are?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Two hundred and fifty out of about 600. So it is being used by these. It is a facility that is there for their use if they wish. We, of course, charge for it. We don't charge for some of the developmental work but we charge for operational costs and time on the computer. It is being used for a student guidance information system, which is an experiment that is now going on in 15 schools to put in guidance information and make it available to students. This is an experiment in a programme which I think will be expanded. About 40 per cent, I think, of the time on the computer is now being used by outside groups rather than our own department.

But I think that in this area is part of the task force that we talked about the other day, the allocation of educational resources, that is going to be working with the school boards to try and set up systems and procedures whereby you will be able to do what the hon. member has stated. At the present time it is sometimes like comparing

apples and oranges because they all use different systems for a lot of their accounting. Although as he has stated, you are able to compare the boards in Metro because the Metro school boards have set up a uniform accounting procedure among the five borough boards and the city of Toronto, we haven't reached the point where we have a uniform accounting procedure across the province at this point.

Mr. Deacon: Is the minister planning to introduce such a system soon so that there will be a basis of evaluation? In my view it is much more important that there be an evaluation of the way the money was spent than a direction from the Department of Education as to how to spend the money. It seems to me very important that the responsibility and the accountability is clearly placed in the hands of the county boards of education, and the department is a source of information and one where the county boards can get ideas as to how others are doing things and whether the methods they are using could be improved. And then, via publicizing their results in a way that is understandable and meaningful—comparative results between boards—there can be a lot of, almost, competition to improve. I think that it is so important that the atmosphere and the direction the department takes goes away from directing to one of evaluating. It goes away from the imposition of actual spending ceilings to one where the control on the spending is really directed by the board itself because it doesn't want to look foolish in comparison with other boards. I would ask the minister to look into really pursuing that role of evaluation for this centre.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, this is precisely our feeling. I don't think it is any secret that there aren't the procedures available to do this in the way that I certainly would like to see it done, and I am sure the way the member would like to see it done.

That's what this educational resources allocation system task force is trying to do, and the association of school business officials is encouraging boards to do this. I think we are making good progress. We are doing it not by directing but by trying to work with boards to develop the kind of systems and procedures and ways that they do things so we will be able to compare and they'll be able to compare.

We are able to do this in an elementary way now. As a matter of fact we will get a comparison of 1971 budgets. How effective this will be we'll not know until the work is completed, but that is under way now.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I hope the minister will ensure that there is a common accounting procedure developed and introduced, after working it out carefully with the various boards of education, so that there is a common system available for next year. Next year, we can start to get comparisons and this committee can see what one board is doing compared to another in the way of results.

I know that the procedures will be rough to start with and there will be many deficiencies in the comparisons but at least it is a guideline. At least it gets it started. As soon as you bring these matters into the light of day you will find means of improving the evaluation process much more rapidly.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'd just like to say, while I share the aim of the hon. member and we certainly want to develop procedures for evaluating boards because they have asked us for this many times, I wouldn't like the impression to be left that we feel the total evaluation of a board or the aims of the educational system in each county board or division board could be evaluated just based on budget comparisons. It will certainly have to be based on a lot of other things and that is only one small part of the evaluation of the whole programme.

Mr. Deacon: I would heartily agree with the minister in that regard, Mr. Chairman. I recognize that. There are many things other than dollars that we are talking about here. I urge the minister to move quickly in this direction. It has taken years for the government to start to recognize the benefits of decentralizing responsibility and accountability, where we as a province stop directing and recognize that the public itself at the community level can give the strongest direction and the best type of direction to meet its own needs as long as the people know what is going on. The former little school sections had the deficiency of operating by themselves. Their results were not known beyond maybe the three trustees and the inspector; it was all kept private. As soon as we start to publish these things in a way that the public as a whole, which is interested, can interpret, I think we'll really get accountability at the local level. It is much more conducive to effective direction by the boards.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 4 carried?

Mr. Laughren: I'm sorry, I thought we were dealing with items 4 to 8 collectively?

Mr. Chairman: I think I would ask the minister—

Mr. Laughren: Would that be all right with the minister?

Mr. Chairman: To put items 4 to 8 together, or would you prefer them separate?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would suggest perhaps 4, 5 and 6, and leave 7 and 8 separate.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other comments on 4, 5 or 6? Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I wanted to ask the minister about the importance given by schools boards to the printouts from the data processing operation having to do with staff complement. The computer is located in the new building over here, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Wells: On the 24th and 23rd floors.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Of Mowat?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The Mowat building.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is sort of getting to be staff room jargon, you know—"What does the computer in the Mowat Block say this month? Do we have to reduce our complement of Spanish teachers by three-eighths again?" That sort of thing.

I always think of it as a sort of joke, and yet it seems to be the information that is fed in having to do with attendance and registrations for succeeding terms. I suppose when you are going to almost a semester system, this will become even more apparent. The thing will chatter away and send a letter back to the board saying that in a certain school the complement is over by so much in this area and that area.

It's quite interesting to hear some of the classroom teachers, friends of mine, beginning to view with some alarm and apprehension what the machine is going to tell the board month-by-month. I presume that this is a bit of a joke and a bit of an exaggeration; and yet it is the sort of thing that leads to—I would say—an undermining of morale at least among those teachers who can see that their name may be about to be fed out by a computer, which becomes more and more the director of education.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess the hon. member is talking about what we call ISS—the integrated student system. This is a system we make available to the school boards that wish to use our facilities. It is there if they want to use it; and if they don't want to use it, that is up to them. It's a system that is there to assist the principal and vice-principal in the administration of his school. It is a case of using the modern, technological computer means that are at hand to presumably assist these fellows who might have had to do it all by hand before; to add up things and get these figures themselves. But it is there as a help for them and we are not forcing it on anyone; it is there for them if they wish to use it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Do most boards avail themselves of this?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I presume some of the bigger ones have their own computer facilities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How many use it; most of them?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Seventy-three schools are using it this year.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments on items 4, 5 or 6?

Carried.

Item 7, grants.

The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Just a couple of quick questions. I am not sure whether this one is relevant or not. Did the grant for the Richmond Hill Dynes, which the minister announced on March 15, come out of the Department of Education budget and did it come out of miscellaneous grants under item 7?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No. I believe it was out of the youth and recreation grants fitness programme, which was in last year's budget, but not in this year's. That's what I think.

Mr. Foulds: I was just wondering why the minister made the announcement then?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm sorry, I didn't catch—

Mr. Foulds: I am just wondering why it was the minister's responsibility to make that announcement?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I guess it was made when I had the branch at the time.

Mr. Foulds: Right!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister something about OISE and the purchase of 248 Bloor St. W. The lot that is there is 100 by 200 ft; and we—the people of Ontario—paid some $800,000 for that lot. It was puzzling enough that our ever-eager Provincial Auditor asked questions about it in his latest report.

I found it unusual that the Provincial Auditor should question very much; and when he did question this one he indicated in his report that he had some difficulty in getting information about it.

Well, I gathered together a fair bit of information and addressed it to the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow), and really the best retreat that he had was to say that he had a request from OISE that they might need that lot some day in the future; and then the bargaining took on from there.

Among my various investigations I ascertained certain reports and requests that indicated that OISE thought it might be a nice idea to make some of this very expensive $800,000 lot available to the city for a park; and on the other half of it—it isn't a very large lot even though it is very expensive—there might be volleyball courts or geodesic domes; or all sorts of wonders of that kind.

I happened to be there the other night, Sunday night, Mr. Chairman, and notwithstanding all the great requests and reports and so on, it seems to be a very dull and uninspiring lot. It just has some tarmac on it which would allow the parking of cars, if the cement bumpers in front weren't so placed that the cars couldn't get in and out. On Sunday night for some reason, one of the bumpers was turned vertically instead of horizontally, so a few cars could get in; but, I presume, after they left, it was turned horizontally again and the lot will continue to sit there.

To make it difficult even for using it for parking, if the minister is familiar with the lot, there are some red brick walls about 4 ft high built along the Bloor St. frontage. This cuts most of the lot off from public view, and where there is a break between the three red brick walls, there is a chain and in these cement bumpers that I was telling you about.

So, it would seem, Mr. Chairman, that for some peculiar reason, the people of Ontario have spent some $800,000 for a piece of property, the use for which is not too obvious. The only explanation, as I say, was given by the Minister of Government Services to the effect that OISE thought it might need it for future expansion.

Not only am I puzzled by all of this background but I am very disturbed, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I went into the financial ramifications of it. It was a very neat deal which enabled a group of entrepreneurs in the city of Toronto to make $400,000 on a $400,000-cash outlay in a period of less than a year, which is a pretty good kind of business, except that they made it at the expense of the government. The minister knows, as we do, that we have been very highly critical of the vast expenditure of public money already put into OISE, the 2-million rental agreement that we entered into—$2 million a year for 30 years—to buy and/or lease, rent-lease or rent-purchase this building.

As my leader has said a few times, we mustn't forget that that $2 million a year includes janitor service, so at that rate it is probably a great bargain. But one has found it very difficult to understand, Mr. Chairman, just what is going on in that building to justify, first of all, the unusual rent-purchase agreement which committed the government to spending $60 million and, secondly, this one.

I hope there is some explanation, because if there is, I wonder why the officials of the Department of Education didn't bother to take the inquiring Provincial Auditor into their confidence. As I say, it is most unusual when the Provincial Auditor chooses to comment even mildly critically about government activities. He did choose in this instance. I have drawn a complete blank with the minister's colleague insofar as any explanation goes. Perhaps the minister can give us some answers now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the only answer that I can give is that the hon. member knows I was not the minister of this ministry at this time. I have looked back in the files. I find that the request to purchase this land was made by OISE. They asked Public Works to purchase the land for them and the reason given was they wanted it for expansion. I know no more than that; that's the sum total of what apparently seems to have transpired. I would gather it was with the agreement of the Department of Education at that time.

Mr. Singer: This is really a non-answer, Mr. Chairman. The minister is asking now in this vote for grants in the total amount of $5,961,-000. Last year his predecessor asked for and got $7,646,000. It would appear that OISE this year is going to get $3,597,000 of this money. I would think that before the minister blithely comes in and puts in his estimates these kind of figures, that he should have some understanding of the basis for the requests. Nobody indicated to us earlier, a year ago, that in the request for this amount of money, OISE was going to embark on this real estate adventure and was going to help several entrepreneurs make a $400,000-profit on an investment of $400,000 within a period of 10 months.

I would have hoped that the minister, having had his attention drawn by the Provincial Auditor to the unusual nature of this purchase, would have brought the officials of OISE before him and said, "What goes on? If you have an expansion programme, tell us about it." Because OISE certainly hasn't come into being or spent the sums of money that it has done without some substantial public controversy. What I'm trying to find out, Mr. Chairman, is why there isn't something better here before us today. Why isn't the minister able to tell us why he should ask now for $3,597,000 in view of the past performance of OISE, the expenditure by OISE recklessly, carelessly of $800,000 of public money, presumably for some idea of the expansion and nobody can even tell us what the expansion is all about? Now, what is the answer?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, the $3,597,000 that we're voting in this estimate is money for the research programme carried out by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. As the hon. member knows, their research programme is financed through this vote; the graduate programme is financed through the BIU, which they get from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities; and I presume the Ministry of Government Services pays that leasing amount the hon. member mentioned and paid the amount to buy that property. That's what I am led to believe from the investigations I have made of this matter so far in my few short months as minister.

I'm aware, of course, of the various feelings around this province about OISE—there are those who are very much pro, those who feel that it does have a significant part to play in the educational process, and those who feel that it should not exist, period. And then there are varying degrees in between.

Now I must say—and I have to be very frank about this—I have still a lot of questions in my own mind about the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Because of these questions, I have asked, along with some of my colleagues, that our cabinet committee on social development undertake a complete review of the position and operation of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, and this is going on at the present time. We want to look at the whole operation, the operation of a graduate programme in education, the research components, all the aspects concerned with the operation of this institute.

As far as this particular purchase is concerned, as I say, all that I have been able to find out in my discussions with the officials of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, their board and the director, is that they felt that they needed this land for expansion; they apparently requested the Department of Public Works of that day to purchase it and the Department of Public Works apparently agreed to purchase it. I assume the Provincial Auditor is now questioning the procedure, because there seems to be some indication that perhaps nothing will ever be built on that land.

At this point in time, I don't know—and I'm being very frank with you— but I hope that we will find the answer out as we on the committee on social development study the future of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, that's not good enough. The minister focused in right on the very problem. He said, "At this point in time, I don't know." Now the Minister of Government Services is the vehicle. He says, "I get a request from Education on behalf of OISE to buy an exorbitantly expensive piece of land—"

Mr. Foulds: He didn't quite phrase it that way.

Mr. Singer: Well, he didn't quite phrase it that way. I am interpolating a little bit.

An hon. member: It sure is helpful!

Mr. Singer: "—an exorbitantly expensive piece of land for the future expansion of OISE." The auditor discovers this and says, "What's it going to be used for?" And somebody says, "Well, recreation." And when we get to the word "recreation" and throw it

at the minister's colleague, he says he understands it's for future expansion.

Well, the recreation thing, notwithstanding representations that were made to the city of Toronto, talks in wonderful terms of volleyball courts and geodesic domes, and I told you what it is being used for right now. It is being used for nothing and it has got cement bumpers to make sure it can't be used for anything, except that when somebody gets the magic answer and can turn the cement bumper vertically instead of horizontally, you could park a few cars in there. An $800,000 exclusive parking lot, if somebody happens to rent the auditorium at the OISE building on a Sunday night and is worthy enough to have the bumper turned from the horizontal position to the vertical position.

How better can we spend the money of the people of Ontario than for a purpose like this? Now, the minister says: "I heard maybe it is going to be used, or somebody said it is going to be used for OISE expansion." Tell us? You are asking for $3,597,000. You are the minister. You are about the only fellow who we can get at insofar as OISE is concerned. What are OISE's plans? Is it going to be bigger and worse than it is now? Is there anybody who is going to exercise any control over it? Or do we just have somebody automatically say: "It would be a good idea if we buy an $800,000 parking lot. Let's buy it," and out goes our efficient Department of Public Works and it buys it and we make a sealed parking lot out of it that is used every other Sunday night, once a year?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: At double the price from what it was 11 months before.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Surely, the minister has to give us some idea of what is the future of OISE. Are they expanding? Are they going to take that east wall out of that building that we are paying $2 million a year rent for and move across another 100 or 200 ft there along Bloor St.? Surely, you must have some sense of responsibility when you bring these estimates before the House. You are asking for some more money? Why don't they come up to Don Mills, I'll sell my house to them for $150,000, quick. I mean, they might want a few trees. It's got a nice place in the backyard for a volleyball court or a geodesic dome.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Yes, you've got it there in your $3,597,000, but when there is this question raised, undiscovered even by the opposition, but discovered by our dogged and researchful and imaginative Provincial Auditor, and he puts it in his report and the minister comes in and says: "Frankly, I don't know," that's ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, first of all, of course, as the hon. member knows, we have been pulling back money from OISE out of this vote and taking it back into the department because this is the research money. This is the research component of what OISE does.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It has been reduced by what—$1.5 million, $2 million?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We took out 20 per cent last year, and 40 per cent, roughly another $900,000 this year. Next year we will be taking back 60 per cent so that we can contract out that research money and OISE can bid on it and so can others in this province. The vote here is the research component of the total operation of OISE.

As I indicated a few minutes ago, and I'm being very frank with you, I don't know what the future of OISE is at this moment because we've asked our cabinet committee on social development to study OISE. I personally feel that it has served a very useful purpose. It has been a unique institution in the educational field in this province and, as it has become better known, as it has become better established, as its graduates are now out among our secondary schools. I think its reputation is gaining. Certainly, it has many graduates who are making a very worthwhile contribution in our secondary school system, and in public school systems around this province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, you can't get ahead unless you go there.

Mr. Singer: It is a nice stopping-off place for members of the educational staff, sure, it is.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As far as the future is concerned, we're taking a total look at it now. All I can tell the hon. member, having been a minister for four years, is that I find through my investigations that the land was bought because of expansion. Certainly, if I had been minister at the time and somebody said: "We want the land for a parking lot, or we want it for recreation," I would never have agreed to them buying that land. A good friend of mine came to me on Sunday,

as a matter of fact, and said the small company that he works for, Eaton's of Canada, had rented space in OISE and when they came up for the meeting they had to park in a public parking lot because those blocks weren't changed and he didn't have the strength that you had to get out and switch them around –

Mr. Singer: No, I didn't say I turned it. It was turned when I got there.

Hon. Mr. Wells: –so he was complaining bitterly to me that the parking lot was sitting vacant. I don't know what the answer to that is because I haven't had a chance to talk to them since then but, certainly, if it is to be a parking lot, it should at least be used as a parking lot. The whole future of the arrangements concerning the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education is being considered by our cabinet committee at this moment and, until that study is done, I am not going to make any predictions as to what they will be.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on that matter, I was interested to hear the minister say that OISE was one of the most impressive developments in education in Ontario. Certainly, it is impressive. When it's unearthed from the rubble a couple of millenia from now, it will certainly be very difficult to find out just what god was being worshipped in that temple. There is no doubt about that.

I can remember not long ago, when we didn't have a nickel for education research in the estimates, urging it on the then minister, together with the member for York South, and we used to have some interesting discussion. It's difficult for me to comprehend the kind of executive thinking that would have led the then minister to decide that that particular edifice was going to be the answer.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It shows just how powerful the member's arguments are.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes. I must be careful not to pray for rain. For the minister to decide that the edifice was going to make something significant in education research leaves me to doubt his judgement in that particular area.

An interesting aspect, too, is that the minister has indicated we are reducing their budget for research purposes quite dramatically. It is going to be reduced 60 per cent this year and 80 per cent next year.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, 40 and 60.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yet I suppose one of the laws of economics indicates that not only is the building fully occupied and fully utilized but, according to the minister, they are even making noises that they want to expand. In other words, much of the research that this building was established to carry out is being done on other university campuses and in other centres. I believe that it is most appropriate and we will certainly not fault the government or the minister for making that change. But doesn't it seem strange that OISE is still expanding at a rate that would be consonant with full utilization of its facilities for research? It just is extremely difficult to understand.

The basic decision was wrong in my view. Surely, we should have used other facilities to build up a body of research facilities in education and, then, possibly move them into a great building after they had shown what they could accomplish or what they might accomplish in the future. We can't castigate this minister for what I consider was a very bad decision of his predecessor back a couple of ministers.

I believe it was a bad decision in the extreme, a waste of public funds. Since that time, not only the department but the administration of OISE has been squirming around trying to justify this vote of confidence and unlimited funds from the former minister, the present Premier (Mr. Davis). So maybe the minister is making as good a job of it as possible when he says the social planning committee is examining the role of OISE. It is something that should have been done before we ever started buying land and pumping money into that tabernacle of so-called educational research.

I think that the requirements for post-graduate degrees for people going on, particularly, into the administrative levels in education is probably all right. I can't find it in my ken to damn it out of hand, although there is a tendency, like so many organiztions becoming more and more professional and trying to become more and more professional, to safeguard themselves in the inner circle with as many hurdles as possible, as many theses on abstract subjects as possible. So, people have to be extremely well motivated and also quite prepared to "fit in," before they get the qualifications and the pieces of paper that will enable them to go on to become administrators, directors and even come into that central Valhalla, the department itself, and get to push the buttons on the computers and ride up and down the elevators of the Mowat Block.

I would say to the minister that this particular conundrum which has been presented to him by the Premier is one of the biggest tests that he will face. I hope that 20 years from now there will be the kind of confidence in what comes out of OISE that was predicted when the building was first voted by the House some years ago now. So far, it has been a disappointment and even an embarrassment. I would agree when the minister says that he thinks that its reputation is improving, now that some of its graduates are going out around the province and they can talk about some of the valuable times they have had during the winter courses and the summer courses.

But I still am sometimes afraid that the philosophy of education there is somehow trumped-up; that it is somehow associated with making the inner core of the directorate more exclusive; it sets up barriers that, in my view, tend to be artificial toward advancement in the profession. It requires the degree work there, rather than recognizing—as I believe it should have been recognized previously—that education as a subject should have been established at almost all of our degree-granting universities; rather than being hived under those very, very artificial, and in my view, detrimental circumstances.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While we are talking about OISE, there are a couple of questions that I would like to raise.

I have a copy of a page from the newsletter from the director of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. It hasn't got a date on it, so I am not sure when it appeared. But the headline on it is: "Regional Centres to be Established in Two Northern Ontario Cities." I imagine that it is about a year ago, I would think, that this newsletter came out. I'll just quote the first paragraph or two to give you the background:

> The institute is planning to extend assistance to northern Ontario educators by establishing two more regional development centres; one in Sudbury and the other in Thunder Bay. If finances permit, the new centre will begin operation in July of this year. Last summer, in an attempt to bring its people and ideas closer to the provinces' classrooms, the institute founded centres in St. Catharines, Peterborough and London. These are small bureaus staffed by one officer or two, whose purpose is to help bridge the gap between theory and practice by making it easier for regional educators and institute staff to work together.

The questions that I have on this matter are: Have those offices been established in Sudbury and Thunder Bay? What personnel are attached to each of these offices? And what is, if you like, the philosophical thrust of OISE in establishing these offices? Are they working in coordination with your regional offices of the curriculum branch? Are they working in competition with it? Are we getting another overlay of bureaucracy here?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, in answer to the hon. member's last question, we are carrying on meetings between staff and our regional office and these field offices of OISE. I don't know if there is any formal arrangement, but certainly we are encouraging our people to know who is in these offices and what is going on.

Now, the statement that I have from OISE about this is that two new field centres opened in the Ottawa and Kitchener-Waterloo areas, and a new centre is to be opened in North Bay. This is in addition to the centres already operating in St. Catharines, Peterborough and London; and one in Sudbury, which I gather has opened. I don't have the names of the personnel who are in these centres. I understand there is usually just one professional person in each of these centres, and perhaps some secretarial staff.

Mr. Foulds: I didn't quite catch that. I gather that since this memo or article came out, there has been no move in Thunder Bay? You mentioned North Bay.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has been indicated that they think there is one in the Lakehead, but the statement that OISE gave me didn't indicate that there was one in the Lakehead.

Mr. Laughren: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, it means that I don't know at this point if there is one in the Lakehead.

Mr. Foulds: Does OISE know?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I would hope so. But there are ones in Sudbury, London, St. Catharines and Peterborough, and they are opening two new ones in Ottawa and Kitchener-Waterloo. That is the information that I have.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me follow this thing up. The minister says he is not too sure, and the social development committee is going to look after it; and so on. But the fact is that you are giving them by grant $3,597,000. Now there is no question about the minister's ability to exercise control if he wants to. I would think that one would want to ask a lot of questions before he put that figure into the estimates and the obvious control that you must have is that the substantial amount of money that OISE is going to get comes by vote of this Legislature to which the minister is responsible.

I just don't think it's good enough when the minister says, "Well, really there are all sorts of other people involved and all sorts of other bodies and they get money from other places and I'm not really sure what they are doing and we are investigating and so on." Surely we are not getting another independent body that wanders around on their own that nobody dares question.

I just don't understand what the usefulness is of having this time set aside for estimates, and the traditional debate about the expenditure of money unless the minister is able to say to us, "This money that I am asking for is going to be spent for this or that purpose and I have control over it." Now that is what he is supposed to do if he is a responsible minister.

Let me go back to my parking lot, the one in which you can't park. Do the representations made by Mr. Jackson, I think it was—I've forgotten who signed the letters—to the city of Toronto council, for permission to carry on all these wonderful athletic activities, have any meaning, or was it just an idea that occurred to somebody and then was dropped?

Did the minister bother to inquire as to whether even that use of the public money was going to be made of that $800,000? If the minister has forgotten I will review it for him, but does he recall that a special application was made to the city of Toronto for permission to have these volleyball courts, maybe geodesic domes and that sort of thing? As I say, the lot is being used for nothing.

The minister says he doesn't know whether it is going to be used for expansion, but does he know whether it is going to be used for recreation or is it going to sit there for continued deliberations which might run for several years? In the meantime, we've got $800,000 sunk into a nice little useless lot on Bloor St.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I have to take responsibility for this amount of money, of course, and I asked what this money was going to be used for. I can tell the hon. member very clearly that this money that we are voting here is the block research grant to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. There are essentially three objectives that this money will be used for and I'm convinced that the institute can live up to these objectives and use the money for these objectives and that's why it is in these estimates. The objectives include school-to-school research and the development of projects in that particular area.

Now, in the development of these projects there is, of course, a certain amount of risk associated with any kind of research in this area that is connected with the new methodology of teaching or research connected with a new task or a new piece of knowledge, or a whole range of activities applying from schoolroom problems to purely academic problems. These are the kind of things which OISE has been asked to do, which I'm convinced they have the capability of doing and which they have been doing. That is one of the objectives of this money here. School-related research is being done.

Another part of this money is used for the development and operation of these regional field centres which, as I just indicated, have been opened in different regions of the province to assist the school boards in those areas and others in education in making use of the kind of research that OISE produces and to make it much more possible for that research to be actually translated and transmitted down into the classroom. I know, from talking to the people at the institute, that this is their objective. They firmly believe that although they may have erred in the past in believing that they could perhaps just carry on research in a kind of an ivory tower, they now see that their research has to be, to a great degree, classroom-child-oriented. When it is done, it's got to be transmitted to where the people are working; to where the teachers, the students, and the school boards and the field offices are to help develop this along with many other things.

The third area of expenditure is in the field of general services. These services are supported both from the block grant and from the funds received from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. They include the operation of a large editorial division for

producing education-related publications, a major research library serving the province as a whole, and finally, of course, some general administration involved in carrying out all these three general thrusts that I have just indicated.

That is what we are voting here today and it is roughly $3.5 million. That's what I have a responsibility for and, as far as I am concerned, the institute can fulfil these objectives and the money that is being voted here is being used in these particular ways.

Mr. Singer: All right, Mr. Chairman, let me persist in this. Let me ask you the very simple question: What are the plans for the fiscal year 1972-1973, of OISE for the use of this lot? Do you know?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'll find out for you. I'll ask them again for you. All I know—

Mr. Singer: Will we have that answer before these estimates are closed?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'll guarantee to give it to the hon. member. I'll ask OISE again and I'll give him their answer at this point, and he can—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Isn't the five-year report ready?

Mr. Singer: Is there no OISE official or expert in that galaxy of advisers you've got there?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I don't know. It may not be the right one.

Mr. Singer: Oh!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Can I add, Mr. Chairman, just to clarify the record, they do have a regional office in Thunder Bay with a staff of two professionals and one clerical.

Mr. Foulds: Just two quick questions then, one relating to OISE and one about the miscellaneous grants.

OISE, I understand, used to make its seminar rooms available to community groups free of charge, and about two months ago began charging. I am thinking in particular of an organization called Community Schools Workshop. I am wondering if there isn't a contradiction in OISE beginning to charge fees for use of the buildings when we are trying to persuade boards of education to allow their facilities to be used on an easily accessible basis at a very minimal fee for community groups?

I wonder if I could have your thoughts on that, Mr. Minister? I'll leave that one because I want to move on to the next item.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think the best I can indicate to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, is that the institute has a schedule of the charges which it makes for its various rooms. I think he asked a question in the House recently and I was still collecting the information, but we have it now. They have charges. They are very nominal charges and I think they would only offset certain operating expenses that would be entailed by making these facilities available. They look to me to be very comparable to what a lot of school boards charge groups, except those either on the free list or lists where the parks and recreation branch of the municipality are picking up the charges.

For instance, they charge $35 an hour for their very large auditorium, and $7 for a classroom or $3.50 an hour for a seminar room. They have other rates which are very much the same.

Mr. Foulds: I would just like to point out though, that is per hour. If you have a three-hour meeting the charges can mount up substantially for a group that doesn't have a source of revenue. At $35 an hour for the auditorium, if you want to have a large public meeting, it might amount to $105 in a day.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I realize, Mr. Chairman, everybody likes to be able to use all facilities free, with no charge to themselves. I guess the institute has found, as many other groups have, that it is absolutely necessary to make some type of charge. I would say, in looking over the list of groups and organizations which have used it, that this hasn't seemed to deter use of the facilities. They are very widely used. It's a case of the philosophy of how you approach this, and I sometimes feel that perhaps it's better for some other mechanism to be found to get funds to those groups that might want to hold meetings there. In this way if they haven't got enough operating capital available to hold meetings in a place like that, they should get help through another mechanism, so that OISE isn't subsidizing all kinds of various groups to have meetings.

OISE's prime purpose is as outlined here —research and graduate programmes—and while we believe its facilities should be used to their fullest, they don't have a budget that reflects total use by all people in the community. And a lot of groups here are not

educational groups in the very strict sense of the word; they're groups who want facilities in which to hold all kinds of meetings.

Mr. Foulds: But surely there could be a list of exemptions, because school boards do this, as you indicated, particularly with regard to recreation, organizations such as Boy Scouts and community groups. Surely OISE should be following the same general philosophy, because after all, as one person put it to me, "If the people of Ontario are paying all the bread for that place, they should be able to use it too."

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I'll pass that on to the board of OISE. It would, of course, come under their purview. I notice that my friend's party uses OISE for quite a few meetings. Would they want to be included on the "free" list?

Mr. Foulds: Oh, of course—for the general public good.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister if OISE is doing any studies concerning the impact, the educational value, etc., of educational TV. Apparently the use of educational TV sort of exploded at one time, but now it seems to have dissipated a bit, and my information is that it's not used to the extent that perhaps even the department thinks it is being used in the school system. I wonder if an issue like this is not one of the topics that should be studied intensely on the part of those in OISE who would have this responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I understand that perhaps more work along the lines the hon. member has mentioned, concerning educational television and its impact, is being done by a small research staff connected with the Ontario Educational Communications Authority. They have their own research department, and I understand they are doing research particularly in this area.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, isn't that really the wrong approach? The minister is trying to have people in educational television justify the use of educational television, rather than have an outside, completely disinterested body that would look upon TV from a different point of view and strictly study its educational impact. It's easy to see that any studies implemented by ETV are going to justify the use of ETV. It's like the police policing themselves. I would think you'd want an impartial and an outside body. One would think that OISE would have thought that this should have been one of the areas of fairly detailed study on its part.

Likewise, I would like to ask the minister if OISE is looking into the physical effects of the abolition of physical education in the schools—of its no longer being a compulsory subject? What effect is it having on the health of the youth? What effect is it having on morale in the schools?

At one time, this department or one department of government mentioned that physical education should be a compulsory subject for all years in high school, even in grade 13. Now, all of a sudden, we're no longer interested in physical well-being. We simply look upon the mental health of the individual and disregard the physical health.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm not aware of anything they're doing in the physical education field. I'd be glad to look into that.

But as I told you, Mr. Chairman, a lot of the research on educational television is being done by the Educational Communications Authority. I suppose you could say they're biased, but after all you might say that the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education are educationalists doing research on educationalists. Maybe they might tend to be a little biased too, but I don't think that this is the case. It comes to my mind that OISE also are doing a multi-media research project that they have going on themselves. It is not just concerned with ETV, but multi-media.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Minister, you didn't answer the question I asked concerning physical education.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I said I wasn't aware of anything they're doing in this area, but I would be glad to inquire if they are. I don't know and I don't have anyone here who can tell me.

Mr. B. Newman: You see, this is one of the problems with OISE. They study everything that is exotic and nothing that really has some effect on the individual and on the basic structure of education.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Further on the charges for the rooms at OISE, Mr. Chairman. Most of our high schools are using the system of only charging for the cost of their custodial staff and others are

moving quickly toward this. Perhaps, in the case of the seminar rooms, if a custodial staff member has to be on hand throughout, then $3.50 an hour might aproximate the custodial staff payment, but $35 an hour for the auditorium is far more than it would cost OISE to make that auditorium available to the groups using it.

I can well see OISE's point, and the minister's point, that OISE doesn't have the funds and shouldn't be expected, perhaps, to subsidize groups using its facilities but I don't see why they should be expected to make a profit. Surely, they must do, at $35 an hour for their auditorium.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, let me correct something first. I notice now that I said before that educational groups and tenants of the building—that is, those people who have rented offices in that building—get a 25 per cent discount from these charges that I indicated to you. They get 25 per cent.

In other words, instead of paying $35 it's 25 per cent discount on the $35 per hour for the auditorium, or on the $3.50 for a seminar room. There are also certain service charges on the hourly rates after 6 p.m., Monday to Friday and on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays which, I assume again, are perhaps for overtime or extra costs involved with staff.

I don't know, but maybe these rates reflect the charges that would be necessary to keep the facilities open. I don't know whether there is a profit in there or not, but as I said, these charges are set by the board of directors of the institute. Really, all I can do is pass on to them your concern and ask them to take a look at it—say that the members of this House think that the board should take a look at this and see if there isn't a better arrangement.

Mr. Bounsall: Would the minister do something a bit stronger than that, and pass on to them the idea that perhaps they shouldn't be making a profit on it at all? They should consider it legitimate to charge whatever is required for them to break even, but they shouldn't make a profit on it.

I'm quite willing to concede that they should break even on the letting of their space, but there is no way, even with the 25 per cent discount on $35 an hour, that it costs OISE that much to make their auditorium available.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I certainly can't accept, at this point, the assumption that they are making a profit. We would have to ask them about that. It is a large auditorium and there are a lot of things connected with it and if that includes the full use of all the facilities of the auditorium, I can see where that could be a fee that is not out of line—considering all the facilities that are needed to get that full auditorium into use, including the stage, the lighting, the air conditioning and everything in that auditorium.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: I want to ask questions about the Moosonee Education Centre, Mr. Chairman. I note the budget is $340,000 this year. How much money will be received from the Department of Indian Affairs for the operation of this and what revenues are anticipated from the Opportunities for Youth, the winter works programme and the Local Initiatives Programme?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that I don't have that information here. I don't know what moneys are available to that centre from the Department of Indian Affairs. I'll find out if any is being paid.

Mr. Deacon: Would you please? Can you give me the enrolment? I want to know whether this money comes directly back to the Department of Education, or whether those funds are in addition to the $340,000 which has been budgeted. Will the minister tell me what enrolment there is in the nursery end of the education centre, what there is in the secondary end of it and in the adult sections, both in the upgrading and retraining programmes?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, in the Moosonee education centre there are 40 students taking grades 9 and 10; and there are 14 adults in the adult upgrading programme. I haven't got a breakdown here of the number in the nursery school; I'd have to get that.

Mr. Deacon: Do you have anything listed for the retraining programme, or is it just the upgrading; isn't it separated?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't have any figures for the retraining. I just have 14 in the adult upgrading programme. Now, they may be either all retraining, or they may be just part of it; I don't know.

Mr. Deacon: Would you please obtain some information on that for me? What staff

do we have for the operation of the Moosonee Education Centre?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'll have to get you that. I haven't got the figures of the number of staff connected with the centre. I'll get you that along with the figures for the nursery school and the retraining.

Mr. Deacon: Well, I'm interested because I think there are 20 on the staff. I'm wondering how you would have a staff of 20 for that operation, if we have, say, 20 in the nursery school, which I think is about the number there; and if we have 40 in the secondary education; and if we have 14 in the adult, according to the figures you have given me. Haven't you examined that in connection with this grant of $340,000 to find out just what the money is going to be used for and in what way?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, perhaps I can get that. As you know, it's not operated directly by us; there is a board up there. I can perhaps find this information for the hon. member.

Mr. Deacon: I realize that's not operated directly by you; neither is the York County Board of Education, but you've certainly examined its budgets in great detail. I would think you would have examined a budget such as this one in some detail. Do you have any idea of the staff? Are there any Indian teachers?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can't tell you.

Mr. Deacon: This is a very disappointing report; not to know more about this venture. I think we spent $2,500,000 on construction of that centre, or was it more?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I think that the hon. member realizes I would be glad to get him this information. But as he has indicated, there is the York county board and there is the Scarborough board. If he had asked me about how many Indian teachers and about how many different teachers and different people there are in the classes, I can get him that information, but I don't necessarily have it right at my fingertips.

Mr. Deacon: I can understand, perhaps, with the others—but Moosonee is a particular situation. It's quite different; one where the community is predominantly Indian—

Mr. Stokes: A model plan.

Mr. Deacon: Pardon?

Mr. Stokes: Yes, it's a model plan.

Mr. Deacon: Yes, a model plan; we have an architect's monument built up there in Moosonee. We've spent tremendous amounts of money on it and we have 14 adults—is it 14 adults you've told me—in the programme? And we have 40 youngsters. Does this indicate that there is an overwhelming demand for the services provided by the centre?

Surely this minister would have been concerned about these figures. Surely this minister would be looking into why we have had no better results and no greater response on the part of the people in that area. After all these years of putting all that money into a building, and each year more and more money into the grant, we have this sort of result.

I am surprised that his staff hasn't brought the situation to his attention and that his staff hasn't been asked for, or carried out, a full evaluation of what is happening up there. Why are we not getting more response? Why do we have a director who has failed to gain the support of the Indian people?

We have people who, I understand, have come down for courses, people who can't speak English and there is not one person who can speak Cree and train them in it. They come down and are sent down from areas to get a course and they go back after a week, because the only people who can teach them are people who speak only English and the Indians speak only Cree. What sort of a waste of our government funds is being carried out and is allowed to be tolerated by this minister and his predecessors, when year after year we have brought this to their attention?

Mr. Chairman, I am ashamed of the situation there. They have built special housing for the teachers. These have built a barrier between the teachers and the people they are supposed to be training that is insurmountable. I would ask the minister to look into these housing costs, the maintenance and how it has been carried out. I hope we will have a full detailed audit of just what is going on up there in Moosonee.

Why are we not getting more value for the dollars we are spending? When you think of the very few people who are being educated or benefiting at all from this $340,000 this year, on top of the millions we have put into that plant, designed by people outside the community who have no understanding of what is wanted by the community, because they didn't ask, I think it is an atrocious

situation. It is a disagree to this province and I would hope that this minister would do something about it.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Can I just say a few words on that, Mr. Chairman? I recall from being here for parts of other debates, that it seems every year someone gets up and makes this kind of a statement about that institution up there. I have visited it in other capacities. It is a very impressive-looking building; and I must tell the hon. member that I am very impressed with the kind of people who are serving on the board up there. I haven't had a chance to visit it as Minister of Education. I promised them that I am going to try to get up there this summer and see it again.

I talked just four or five weeks ago to the Rev. John Clarke, whom you perhaps have met. He is a very dedicated person and I certainly put some faith in his assessment of this situation. He tells me that, indeed, the Moosonee Education Centre is fulfilling its purpose. Its effect and usefulness in that community is growing—in fact, so much so that they are coming in and asking me if they can sit down and consider plans for expansion, because they see their programme expanding and outgrowing that building.

I haven't indicated anything about that at this point in time, but I certainly intend to go up myself and look at it. When I talk to people like that, I get an entirely different story from what I hear from this hon. member and from other members who have stood up and talked about this and, then, gone up and seen what is happening up there and have felt quite differently about it.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the Rev. John Clarke. I have met him and I know he is doing his best in that area. But I also am concerned to read what is happening here in your enrolment. I am concerned that you are having staff problems from people who are dismayed by the way the situation is being operated.

Whatever the cause, I think most of it is certainly because we continue to think that somehow we who come in from the outside have a better knowledge of how to deal with and how to solve the problem of the people in that area than they would have themselves. I remind the minister that the most important steps ever made in any Indian education have been made in the States, in the Navaho Reserve, where the community has taken over control, without strings, of the operation of their educational facilities.

Despite their lack of education themselves, the councils have shown tremendous initiative, tremendous insight, in developing programmes that have the full total response of the community. We have a lot more than 40 secondary school youngsters, a lot more than 14 adults, who, I'm sure, would be taking advantage of the opportunities in Moosonee if they themselves had more to do with what is being produced and had their own people teaching them and providing the courses that they decide—not me, from the outside—are required for them to upgrade and retrain and become able to make a better life for themselves in that country.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I want to return for a few moments to that item in the estimate having to do with OISE. The hon. minister will remember that, I would think, three years ago, maybe four, a rather searching and critical assessment of OISE was made by this estimates committee.

The atrocity of the lease arrangements was the springboard from which it took off but then the whole apparatus was placed under surveillance with something like a magnifying glass at that time. I don't think our intention is to do that today.

I would draw the minister's attention, however, to the public accounts as of March 31, 1970, in which the amount of money expended to that date, for that previous fiscal year, was $9,540,000 whereas before us today—and two years later, into the next fiscal year—the amount is about $3,500,000, a drop of $6 million. That is very substantial. That is a most searching kind of move on the part of the government.

As everyone in this House probably knows, OISE, as a research institution, is California's basic gift to the educational system of Ontario. At that time, when we were making the assessments or judgements upon it, one of the problems was—and I don't want to elaborate on this; I just want to mention it in passing—I would like to know the complement of staff, the full number of staff today as against two years ago. There must have been fairly deep-reaching cuts to have this profound alteration in the budget. I would like to know—and this is the one I don't want to elaborate upon—at that time the complement had a high incidence of American representation and importation into OISE for so-called research purposes. I suspect that that has been rather

eliminated or reversed as things presently stand under the fairly new director. I nevertheless would like to see some statistics or information under that particular head.

The information given by the minister this afternoon as to the moving of OISE into the community—that it will receive some rapport, some feedback and feed-in to the educational system actually working in this province—is a most welcome utterance. Perhaps the most lancing criticism at the time I mentioned was precisely that it was an isolated institution supposedly working over problems peculiarly Canadian or even Ontarian in the educational sphere, and it was most remote; there was no kind of working back and forth. The teachers out there felt OISE had little to do with them. As far as the mandate coming down from above was concerned it simply didn't filter through in any recognizable or human form or in any applicable way. They were living in the ozone 10,000 ft up and quite remote from the world as it is.

Apparently and, possibly, partially because of the criticism levelled at that time, the orientation has now been altered and that is all to the good. The real question one would have to ask about OISE is what good ever came out of it? Can the minister name me, Mr. Chairman, a single methodological or educational reform that has emanated from that house? For all its marvellous people—I have met many of them, many brilliant people there—for some reason there is a very confined inbreeding and suffocating atmosphere, if you will, or has been. Imagine a research institute with inbred suffocation! It kind of runs against the grain.

The great changes that are in the air with respect to education in the modern world come not from educational institutes, from self-established and inward elites in this particular regard but from quite renegade people out there who have no identity with regular institutions. I. I. Lake is a case in point, of course. I was reading the other day a man by the name of Sri Aurobindo from Pondicherry, South India, who is setting up a workshop concept there on how the children of India and the east—and it may have application to the children here—might be educated in the use of hands, the type of inquisitiveness that is developed, the cosmic sense of our identity with the earth, and the meaning of our lives.

Aurobindo is very attuned to contemporary psychology and says in one sentence, which kind of startled me, that children raised lonely, away from communication with other children, statistically are the ones least likely to marry. In other words, they don't bring other children into the world. On the basis of that kind of information he sets up an interlacing and conversation-oriented type of education.

I think education, basically, was founded on conversation and to the extent that we converse with one another about things that move us, to that extent we are educating each other, and you can't move beyond that. The formal structures tend to sterilize conversation and make it superficial.

In this particular regard I would like the minister to indicate to me the complement of the school and the American weight there. I would also like him, if he will, to supply me, as has been done in past years, with a list of the studies presently being undertaken and, perhaps, the ones that have been completed within the last year.

The trouble with American institutions, by and large, right across the board and of all kinds, is that they engage too much in my opinion in cyclometric studies. They want to quantify everything. They want to get it down to the mensurable because it gives a sense of attainment, a sense of the tangible, that you have accomplished something. You can put it out in black and white; you can lay it down on a blackboard whereas the other elements which require infinitely greater subtlety, which would change the soul of man, are neglected in institutions of that kind. If there is anything that has to be changed it is the soul as things presently stand.

I am interested in the range of studies and what is being done at OISE and would ask the minister to be kind enough to supply these to me.

Finally, before sitting down, I would like the minister also to indicate on a quite different subject: For instance, a number of years ago the Ontario Council for the Arts were within the terms of this vote. Of course, this vote was 10 times greater in size—about $14 million against $4 million this year—to what it is today.

Could the minister indicate to me, apart from that council, what has been taken out of the vote and transferred to other votes, other departments of government and what remains in, for instance, as set forth fairly elaborately at page 4-20 of the previous public accounts where there is a substantial list of recipients of grants?

A third and final question has to do with the Shaw festival. Is that not one of the grants that would fall under your designa-

tion? In these previous public accounts, the sum given to the Shaw festival is $250,000. Are you still giving it, is it through your instrumentality that it is given and, if so, how much is it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I'll answer the last question first. No, that grant is not still in our department. It would be through the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts which is now in the Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

With regard to the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the hon. member asks, what concrete things the institute has done if we could put it in very simple language.

I think the institute's worth can be proved by the number of graduates of its programme who are now out in our system. Many of them are friends of mine, personal friends of mine, and I think that the school system is the better for the fact that these people have taken graduate training in this institute.

I think that the kind of programme that they have there—and I'm not an educationist, like my friend the Leader of the Opposition, so I can't use some very critical techniques to evaluate the kind of programme that is in progress there—but from what I find among friends of mine who have attended that graduate programme, it has improved their usefulness to the educational system and to the children they teach. I think, first and foremost, this has to be one of the benefits to this province of this institute.

Mr. Lawlor: That is a bald statement. Can you exemplify that and give me a bit more?

Hon. Mr. Wells: All I'm saying is these people, who are principals, heads of departments and subject directors and so forth, who are actually working in our system with children, either teaching or preparing and assisting people to teach and who are administering our system, have been able to come down and take either full-time or part-time courses in this atmosphere that has been created for a post-graduate degree in education. From there, I think, they have been able to take back those things they have learned and do a much better job.

I suppose it's that any person who takes a post-graduate degree or graduate training in some field is going to attempt to do to improve himself in the future. It may only be pursuing studies for the sake of study, but presumably he can do it better and with more fulfilment because he has been exposed to certain graduate programmes. I think that this has to be one of the benefits of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, I don't know, I once took a personal graduate study and look what it did for me.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, my friend may disagree. I can't speak from any experience because I didn't take any graduate programme, although, I venture to say, being a member of this House on the government side or the opposition side is a more realistic graduate programme than any you would find in any university—if you do your job—

Mr. B. Newman: Do you get degrees for that, too?

Hon. Mr. Wells: You get no degrees; in fact, you get no thanks most of the time.

With regard to actual research, I'm just thinking of a few things that come to mind and they may not be momentous research projects but there is a study that I think had quite good acceptance and appeal. "Volunteer Parental Assistance in Elementary Schools," by Henry Hedges. I think that that study has been useful to people in the educational system.

Another one that comes to mind is Study on Prejudice in Textbooks which was a study that has had an impact on many people in this province and has drawn to our attention some things that were happening and it will prove beneficial in the long run to the educational system in this province.

I know that there is a study presently being carried on at the institute by two young gentlemen. It's a very in-depth detailed study of the two-tier system of school administration in Metropolitan Toronto, and I have great hopes for this study as being one that will be of benefit to us and to all those in Metropolitan Toronto when it is completed. I hope it will be, but I understand it is halfway through.

When I was in my former ministry I was instrumental in having a study begun by Dr. Flower at OISE on early childhood education, and I certainly believe that this will be beneficial. It is a long-term study over about three or four years and it is to be measured along with a study done in Ottawa. I am sure they will have an impact on the kind of planning that is done, not only at the completion of their work but as they continue; the input from it will be helpful in the development of our early childhood programmes, junior kindergarten

programmes and so on. Those are just a few that come to mind at the moment.

I might say that the drastic difference in budgets that the hon. member draws to our attention is really not as dramatic as the figures that he quoted would indicate. As a matter of fact, the budget is probably about the same. As I indicated earlier, it is the method of financing the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education that is now different.

The graduate programme is financed under the basic income units vote of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, and while I don't know the exact amount of money that will go to the institute because it is determined on the number of graduate students they have there, in round figures it will be around $4.5 million. So that should be added to the $3.5 million we have in this vote to see a better idea of what the institute is costing.

Now, regarding the $9-million-odd quoted by the hon. member, we of course have instituted our new policy of taking back research money from the institute—20 per cent last year, 40 per cent this year—and that again has reduced the amount of research money that goes to the institute. We have taken that back to put it in as research money in our own vote—the vote we had a few minutes ago. That has tended to lessen the amount going to OISE, but actually I think he would find the amount they are getting is just about the same.

As for the actual complement figures and the percentage who are Americans, I will get that information for the hon. member as soon as I can.

Mr. Lawlor: Could the minister also give me a list of the ongoing studies?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Just one other question under this: There are two great reports—well, I shouldn't give it too much splendour—there are two major reports that have been made in the past few years. I would like to have made available to me, if that is possible, any studies that have arisen out of the Hall-Dennis Report, assessing or analysing Hall-Dennis to see to what extent agreement was reached within the institute itself or what added emphasis might have been made from studies.

The second one was the Mackay report, particularly on religious education. I met one professor in the institute, a fellow from Australia, a thoroughly delightful man; he was studying that, giving it a good deal of time and effort. I would hope by this time he has published something with regard to it, so we would have more before us as to the whole impact, particularly as to the possibility of world religious studies, which interest me somewhat, being taught in the schools.

It seems to me you would have to be of cosmic mind, not only to encompass these four great religions in a way that indicated understanding—namely, doing it sympathetically—and then to be able to assess, weigh, compare and give it in an objective way to the people you are teaching so that you do not bias the issue in advance. So any studies emanating from OISE in this particular regard would be all grist to my mill at least, and I would be pleased to receive any such thing.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7. The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: It suddenly just clicked in my mind in the last exchange; in the statement that the minister made, is he telling us that about $4½ million of OISE's budget is still with Colleges and Universities through the BIU?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. Foulds: This is not the place, but certainly that information did not come out in the discussion of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. It was very neatly hidden by this government and I think I would like to get that on record.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has never been hidden by myself and I am sure that my colleague didn't intend to hide it. I don't know whether in your review of his estimates you asked what was included in the vote under assistance to universities, but it would be in there because they are treated as graduate students and they receive whatever the basic income unit is that applies to graduate students on the numbers there. This is how they are funded now.

Mr. Foulds: I was trying to underline what I think is a basic problem, not with the minister or with his colleague in Colleges and Universities, but the problem that we face in the opposition in terms of giving a serious analysis of the budgetary spending of the government, in that the information that is provided in this estimates book is superficial to say the least.

I know it is a formula that is used, but when you take a look even at this ministry's expenditures, the sort of almost sterile and automatic categories tend to hide expenditure, and I feel somewhat chagrined to find out that $4½ million has gone by the board without adequate discussion by this Legislature. I just want to say that, and serve warning on whoever is the Minister of Colleges and Universities next time round that that particular item will be discussed, and I know I am out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Okay. I just want to get into the other items in your ministry, Mr. Minister. On grants, and that's item 7, over on page 289 where it is a little bit more detailed, in the miscellaneous grants there is an amount of $366,500. I understand the grants that have formerly—

Mr. Stokes: That's petty cash.

Mr. Foulds: Now I know this is an estimate so you don't have the list for the coming year, but I would like the list of last year's grants in that category. It indicates they are to be paid as may be directed by the minister, and I would like to find out what organizations and what projects the minister, last year at least, felt were worthy of these miscellaneous grants.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member like me to read the whole list of those named and those in miscellaneous, or just what we call the MM ones, "miscellaneous miscellaneous"?

Mr. Singer: How many categories do you have?

Hon. Mr. Wells: As you probably appreciate, in last year's estimates there were quite a number of grants that were named. They have all been cut out this year.

Mr. Stokes: Let's have them.

Mr. Singer: No election this year.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We cut out the listing of them. I'll give you all of them if you wish: The African Educational Ministers Conference, $250; Air Cadet League of Canada, $3,000; Alcohol and Drug Concerns Inc., $3,500; Association Canadienne d'Education de Langue Francaise, $6,000; Association Canadienne Francaise de l'Ontario, $2,500, and then $10,000 for a total $12,500; Boy Scouts of Canada, Provincial Council of Ontario, $17,500; Boys' Clubs of Canada, $5,000; Cadet Organizational Police School, $5,000; Canadian Committee's "Canada Week," $10,000; Canada's Sports Hall of Fame, $10,000. It must be remembered that last year we had the sports function in the ministry and that is why there are sports grants in here.

Canadian Association for Adult Education, $10,000; Canadian Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (Ontario Division), $3,000; Canadian Council for Research in Education, $16,787; Canadian Education Association, $65,300; Canadian Irish Studies Committee, $13,345.51; Canadian Library Association, $2,000; Canadian National Institute for the Blind, $125,000; Canadian Special Olympics for the Mentally Retarded, $7,500; Canadian Vocational Association, $6,000; Champlain Society, $5,000; Consumers' Association of Canada, $2,000; C. H. Berner Public School, $2,500; Corporation of the City of Kingston feasibility study for yachting events, 1976 Olympics, $22,499.99.

English Catholic Education Association of Ontario, $2,500; Evangelical Church of the Deaf Ontario Mission Youth Hostel, $5,000; Federation des Associations des Parents des Instituteurs de la Langue Francaise d'Ontario, $2,000; Federation of Canadian Music Festivals, $500; Federation of Catholic Parent Teachers Association of Ontario, $5,000; Forbes Community Recreation Association, $1,200; Fort William Male Voice Choir, $2,500; Frontier College, $7,500.

Hamilton Police Male Chorus, $5,000; Indian Eskimo Association of Canada, $3,500; Institute Canadien Francaise d'Ottawa, $500; Institute of Public Administration of Canada, $22,242; Italian Community Education Centre, $10,000; L'Association des Commission des Ecoles Bilingues d'Ontario, $500; Le Recontre '71—I am sorry, wait a minute now —yes, $500.

National Ballet School (Toronto), $160,000; National Theatre School of Canada, $78,000; Navy League of Canada, $3,000; Neill-Wycik College Co-op Conference, $1,500; Niagara Falls Festival, 1972, $5,000; Northern Ontario Public and Secondary School Trustees Association, $300.

Ontario Association for Continuing Education, $12,000; Ontario Committee for Education Week, $2,000; Ontario Craft Foundation, $60,000; Ontario Education Association, $17,500; Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations, $13,000; Ontario Federation of School Athletic Associations, $20,000; Ontario Girl Guide Association, $15,000; Ontario Institute of Painters, $1,000; Ontario Library Association, $1,000; Ontario Mathematics Commission, $5,000; Ontario Muni-

cipal Recreation Association, $25,000; Ontario Public School Trustees Association, $10,000; Ontario-Quebec Permanent Commission, $5,000; Ontario School Trustees Council, $11,300; Ontario Secondary School Students Committee (Provincial Interscholastic Conference, 1972), $2,000; Ontario Separate School Trustees Association, $500; Ontario Society for Crippled Children, $6,000; Ontario Youth Concert Band, $2,000; Overseas Book Centre, $5,000.

Royal Life Saving Society of Canada, $2,000; Sail Canada Ltd., $12,048.46; Sail Ontario Inc., $10,000; Stratford Shakespearean Festival Foundation of Canada, $65,000; Sudbury Summer 71, $9,000; Theatre Hour Company in trust, $70,000; Ukrainian Prosvita Ladies' Choir of Thunder Bay, $1,000; United Nations Association in Canada, $3,500; United Nations Association, Metropolitan Toronto Branch, $3,500; United World College Canadian National Commtitee, $4,500 and the Workers Educational Association, $6,000.

Mr. Foulds: May I just ask a question for clarification? These have nothing to do with any of the grants given by the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts—that list you have just read?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is right. Last year they received a block grant and then they distributed grants also.

I think some member asked me a few minutes ago what the difference was in this vote. Out of this total vote of grants from last year and some of those I read off that were made last year, the following were transferred to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities: the grant to the Ontario Association for Adult Education, $12,000, the Canadian Vocational Association, $6,000, the Council of Ministers of Education, $50,000, Canadian Association for Adult Education, $10,000, Frontier College, $7,500, Workers Educational Association, $6,000 and the Champlain Society, $5,000. That $96,500 in grants has been transferred to Colleges and Universities and shows in their budget this year.

These grants that I am now about to read have been transferred to the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts which reports to Colleges and Universities: the National Ballet School, $160,000, the National Theatre School, $78,000, the Stratford Festival, $65,000, the Theatre Hour Company, $70,000, and miscellaneous other art bodies, $50,000, for a total of $423,000.

Then the transfer into our ministry in this vote is the grant to the Canadian Education Association. Colleges and Universities used to give a grant to the association also and that now has all been incorporated into our grant in this vote. That transferred $10,000 into this vote.

Also, as you know, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education vote is in this vote. A decrease of $899,000 is the amount that we talked about that was taken out of the OISE vote and put into an earlier vote for the research grant. The Moosonee Educational Centre grant has been increased by $24,000 this year and there is another $9,700 in the Canadian Educational Association grant.

When you total it all up, there is a decrease in grants in this vote this year of $1,498,000.

Mr. Foulds: One further joint of clarification on this specific point. Am I to understand then that arts groups would now be excluded from this vote entirely and they will apply directly to the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, basically, that is right. To avoid duplication, those groups should do that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the minister if in the allocating of the grants to any of the associations that he has done or intends to do, if he asks for any type of a financial statement? Such a statement would enable him to see if the association actually needs money or if it has a reserve fund and is simply trying to add to its reserve fund so that it would have enough in the future if at any time its funds run a little low. There must be some guidelines before an organization or association would get grants. Would the minister mind telling us?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, this is the statement that is sent to the groups—the criteria for miscellaneous grants:

One, a province-wide organization rather than local; generally a non-profit organization; objectives consistent with those of the Minister of Education; a demonstrated financial need, i.e., absence of surplus; applicant must file latest audited financial statement and current budget; charitable organizations registration number assigned by the Department of National Revenue and Taxation; a

general statement as to the use to which it is intended the grant will be put. The statement also includes our endeavours to avoid the impression that miscellaneous grants will be available for such things as capital projects and bailing out an organization that is going into bankruptcy and things like this.

Now, I might tell the hon. member that as he can see, the amount of money available here is greatly reduced this year. Early in this year a letter was sent by the assistant deputy minister of financial administration in our department to all groups that receive grants, in effect sort of indicating to them that they shouldn't expect their grant this year, and putting it in such a way that if they really wanted another grant they would have to reapply; they would have to send their financial statement; they would have to prove to us that they need it.

Perhaps the hon. members heard from some of the groups because everybody had this letter. To this point in time, the assessment of who will be getting grants this year has not been made. I might also tell the hon. members that the new policy of the government is that all these grants, grants out of this vote and this particular area of my department, this miscellaneous grant fund, and indeed all the grants from any of my colleagues' ministries, now must go to Management Board on a special form and be approved by Management Board before they can be paid. So they are really not just there for the discretion of the minister of this department or indeed of any department of the government, but of the Management Board of Cabinet.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the minister for the information, and I am very pleased to see that the department now finally has followed a recommendation or suggestion by those of us in opposition, that before any types of grants are given, some type of need be shown, be demonstrated, because in the past they seem to have been given simply on application without any proof of need.

I'm not going to appeal to the minister for any grants for any organization in my own community because if they wish they will do so themselves.

May I ask of the minister on this same vote under the superannuation provisions that are recorded—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Maybe we could finish this one before we move into the superannuation provisions.

Mr. B. Newman: All right.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, I wanted to engage the minister for a few minutes on the subject of the grants. I think it is the first time that I have ever asked for a grant on behalf of my group and I am very reluctant to do so. But in this particular case it was the Marathon Drum and Bugle Corps and a chap who is doing an excellent job with, I think it is 140 youngsters in the town of Marathon.

They have taken the band out to the Calgary Stampede. They won the small town award, or the band award for small towns right across Canada. I think they participated in the Santa Claus parade here in Toronto. They have participated in the Winnipeg Santa Claus parade. They did this wholly and solely on their own initiative. Because of the popularity of the programme in the town of Marathon, and the attractiveness of the programme, in place of the 30 or 40 youngsters that he started out with he has now got 140.

He has neither uniforms nor instruments to keep them all going. They are passing instruments from one to the other. They are running in and they are changing uniforms from one to the other.

I made an application to the youth and recreation branch asking if they might assist this worthwhile group and they said no. I went to the Ontario Council for the Arts and they said no. I'm not making much headway with the federal government, but this is the only band of its kind in all of northwestern Ontario. They go at the drop of a hat for any kind of an affair simply because they are the only one in the area.

You mentioned, in some of the criteria that you demanded before a grant could be authorized, that it be province-wide in scope. Yet on the list that you read out, there was one grant for $2,500 to, I think he said Berner Public School. There was a recreation association in Forbes, I think he said, for $2,500. The Fort William male choir which is certainly not provincial in scope, got $2,500. The Prosvita choir got $1,000, which is certainly not provincial in scope.

Yet this Marathon drum and bugle corps, as I say, is the only one in existence in all of northern Ontario that I know of, is doing an excellent job with inadequate funds. I'm not suggesting for one minute that it should be a continuing thing, but because they neither have instruments nor uniforms to accommodate the number of people that they

have in the programme, and that are desirous of continuing the programme, I am wondering why somebody in your department didn't indicate that there were funds for such a worthwhile cause. Will the minister consider it at this time?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, when that grant was made I wasn't minister at the time, I don't think. We haven't made grants to bands for uniforms or instruments. Basically, this hasn't been the purpose of this miscellaneous grant fund. We do find that there are lots of bands, although I realize the hon. member is making a very valid point by saying that this is one of the few in northern Ontario, I guess. However, I suspect there are probably a few others, are there not?

Mr. Stokes: There could be, but I am not aware of them.

Hon. Mr. Wells: At Sudbury, and perhaps the Lakehead. But, as I understand it, by and large, there are a great number of musical organizations, particularly drum and bugle corps bands, requesting funds because, as the hon. member is probably aware, they have competitions practically every weekend in the summer in a great number of areas and they need a lot of assistance.

It hasn't been our policy to make grants in this area. It is an area that perhaps we could take a look at. I still think that perhaps this is an area in which the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts should be interested, because it does directly concern music. It directly concerns one of the areas which they are supposed to be assisting and fostering, namely, the development of music among all the arts across this province. But we'll take a look at that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on my annual appeal on behalf of the Air Cadet League. Before I do, I would like to make just a few short remarks in general regarding the giving of grants to groups.

There were two groups of musicians from my area who were very much disappointed when they travelled to Expo in Osaka, Japan, in 1970 that they couldn't get a grant of any sort from the government of Ontario. I appealed on their behalf to at least six various cabinet ministers, plus the Premier of the province, and couldn't get five cents. They had to raise $38,000 in the one case, and $46,000 in the other case, to make the trip. They did everything. They worked. It was amazing that they were able to raise the money. The parents put up money and, finally, both groups—one was a glee club and the other was a band—made the trip to Japan and did a very commendable job over there.

I thought it was very discouraging both from my point of view and from their point of view—and the one band was officially representing high schools in the province—that they couldn't get any financial help from the government of Ontario. I know it must be a terribly difficult task to decide who should get how much in the form of grants and whether one cause is more deserving than another.

Without taking away from the merits of any group, I would just like to say this. I think the Air Cadet League of Canada has been getting $3,000 from the government of Ontario for dear knows how many years—for as long as I have been here, which is five years—and the amount hasn't changed. When one considers the work that is being done with young men in the Province of Ontario by such groups as the Air Cadet League, I think that the minister should take a good hard look at these institutions, not with the thought of cutting out somebody to increase the grant to someone else, but it appears to me in many instances it is just a case of a token grant, of saying that will keep them quiet now for another year, and if we give them any more they will be back wanting more the next year.

I really think that one must consider the character-building values that are in some of these, especially with our young people, the discipline that is learned in such a thing as the Air Cadet League, the matter of working together, and the sense of accomplishing something as a unit. This was brought out to me very recently, as I acted as reviewing officer for a cadet high school annual review and march past. I thought work done with these young men in their high school age groups was of great importance.

It is most important, I feel, that the government consider the value, not for just today but for the future, when you are looking at the grants that are being given to groups such as this. So, on behalf of the Air Cadet League of Canada, might I ask the minister would it do any good if there was a concerted lobby made by the Air Cadet League on the minister over the next 12 months? Could their grant be reconsidered? I have spoken

on this almost every year since I have been here, and the grant still stays at $3,000 from the government of the Province of Ontario.

Now that we have a new minister, maybe he will give a little new direction and a new sense of priorities to the great work that is being done; not only by this group, but by all the groups that he has mentioned in the last short while.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member strikes a nostalgic point with me. Being a former member of the Air Cadets of Canada, I have to share his enthusiasm for this group. I might say that he doesn't have to organize a lobby. All they have to do is to write me directly, and tell me of their needs and send us their financial statement, if they haven't already done this. It will receive careful consideration.

I might just tell the hon. member I have been looking at some of these already, and I understand that the Air Cadet League, for instance, had a surplus last year. That is one area we have to look at when money is a little tight. If they had a surplus, well then perhaps they are entitled to our $3,000 grant. But it certainly doesn't suggest to me that they need more, because the $3,000 may be part of their general budgeting. I can't recall how much of a surplus, but I seem to recall that they did have a surplus last year.

All I am suggesting is that they should write us, send us their financial statement, and tell us a little bit about why they think we should continue to assist them. This is the process that we are going through this year. We sent everybody the same letter which, in effect, has said to them, "You know, that's it, there are no more grants." This has made everybody assess their position. They should send us their financial statements, and put down in writing why they think we should assist their group. Just send it to us, and we will look into it.

Mr. Foulds: One last comment. I hope when you reviewed this programme you did take a look at some of the priorities. I am going to take a look at the list as you read them when Hansard comes out. It seems to me there is a kind of imbalance between—and I may be wrong here, I may not have caught the figure. But $3,000 given to an association for learning disabilities seems to me to be relatively small in comparison to, and I think the figure is correct, $22,000 for yachting events.

Now, I know that there are various factors taken into consideration. But I think that, as you say, we have to look at the balances within the organization and take a look at the genuine social and educational values inherent in these programmes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We give them grants from a couple of—

Mr. Foulds: Well, I know I can't ask the minister. Perhaps we can get this when we get to his colleague on his immediate right—the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch). But you know one of the problems we have is that it is so easy to say they get grants from other departments. I really would like to pull together somehow the comparative figures that we do get.

Hon. Mr. Wells: So would we. That is part of our aim.

Mr. Foulds: Let's hope we can do that for next year's estimates. I am sure that my colleague from Lakeshore would like to put on the record that the amount of $13,000 for Canadian Irish studies is certainly a very worthy one.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7 carried?

Hon. Mr. Wells: May I, Mr. Chairman, just before this item might be carried? I would like to indicate that the staff at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education today is 649, of which approximately 130 are classified as academics. Two years ago the complement was 646, of which, I am told, about 130 were academics. And the percentage today of the academics who are classed as Americans on the staff is about 33 per cent.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7 carried?

Carried.

Item 8?

Mr. B. Newman: No, Item 7. I have been speaking on it previously and was told to complete the grants first. I want to ask the minister about the superannuation provisions in there. I notice that there is $4.2 million.

Mr. Chairman: That is item 8.

Mr. B. Newman: No, I am on item 7—grants at the bottom of page 289, Mr. Chairman. If you'll notice the detailed breakdown on page 289, there are payments included to the teachers' superannuation commission.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is on section 8.

Mr. B. Newman: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is section 8, I think.

Mr. B. Newman: Section 8. Payments to teachers—

Mr. Chairman: Item 7 carried.

Item 8. The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, I was a little confused there, Mr. Chairman, because one seemed to run right into the other.

I wanted to ask the minister, concerning the last item on the bottom of page 289, if the amount in there is a continuing grant to the superannuation commission; or is it an escalating one? And if the department is considering, rather than making the supplemental retirement benefits a two per cent allowance; making it a cost-of-living scale equivalent and similar to what the federal government now is doing with old age security?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That particular item, the amount of $4,200,000, is a set amount which is there; it's not in as part of the funds. It's an amount the government allots each year in each pension to allow the two per cent yearly increase. Now, I think the hon. member is talking about the automatic escalation clause in the pensions.

Mr. B. Newman: I'm asking, Mr. Minister, if you are considering eliminating that two per cent and that clause; and putting in an automatic escalation clause for the cost of living.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I can tell the hon. member that this is something which the Ontario Teachers Federation has asked us to consider; the provision of an automatic cost of living escalation. We are discussing this with them at the present time. Also it seems to me it would take about an increase of a half of one per cent contribution on behalf of the teacher and a half of one per cent on behalf of the government; but also a contribution by the government of $50 million a year over the next 18 years on top of this, because of our existing pension benefits Act.

Now, this is the reason we are exploring this with the teachers federation, with the pension benefits commission of the province. So there is no definite decision or policy as to whether or not this will be done, but it is being very actively explored by the teachers superannuation commission, the teachers federation, the pension commission, and so forth.

Mr. B. Newman: Right! I can readily appreciate the minister's comments. I bring it up because of the federal approach to old age security. I thought that the department would simply copy what the federal authorities were doing and automatically write in that similar type of escalation clause; not only into teachers' pensions, but in any type of pension that involves the government of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Item 8. The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: A couple of questions about the superannuation fund, Mr. Chairman. I noticed in an answer that was tabled in the legislature on Friday last about the teachers superannuation commission—that was on page 2874. I'd like to ask basicailly what happens to the government contribution that is listed there? I noticed in the balance of the figures that are given in 1971, for example, the payment to teachers was $52,547,604. The teachers' contribution that year was $51,772,320. Basically as you go up those columns, except for the 1930s, the teachers' contributions match the payments out to teachers. I want to know what happens to the government contribution.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, as for the government contribution and the teachers' contribution—I suppose it depends on which way you look at it—the amounts paid out are in part out of the teachers' contributions and partly out of the government contributions. In other words, in order to carry on the superannuation fund, six per cent of the teacher's salary is put in and matched by the government at six per cent.

If you take any year, such as the hon. member has done in answer to that question, it looks like the amount which is paid out in benefits is about equal or perhaps a little above than the amount of the contributions of the teachers or the government.

But I think the answer is that if at any given point in time everyone in the fund was to get his benefits from the fund—for those entitled to a pension, be it a full pension or a partial pension; those who were entitled to a refund of their money—because the fund was being disbanded, say, it would take all the teachers' money and the government money, plus more because the fund is not actuarially sound, to pay everybody at the given point in time. Therefore, that is the way it must be funded.

As the hon. member is probably aware, the money that is not being used is lent back to the government and the interest rate is now six per cent. It has risen from 4½ to 4¾ to five per cent; this year it is being lent to the government at six per cent interest. And that interest also provides a lot of money back into the fund, as I think the answer to the question shows.

Mr. Foulds: If I may just pursue this a moment, surely in one sense if we have two taps they are both going into the teachers' superannuation fund. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Foulds: Right, okay. I gather they are bound to invest this in government bonds; this is correct, is it? Surely the interest that accrues—six per cent—in this day and age is a pretty low rate of interest, and they should be given the opportunity to invest in more profitable bonds. If I am not mistaken, the superannuation fund of the teachers of the State of New York invests in other Ontario government bonds at a higher rate of interest. Surely Ontario teachers should have the same privilege?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the six per cent applies to money which has been invested but new money that will be put into government bonds will get the average rate paid on other long-term loans, so that it likely will be higher than this in the future.

But I think the point here again is that the payout or pension benefit really is not dependent upon the interest the money earns. Probably the interest the money earns means that the amount the government has to put in beyond its matching contribution is less because the fund isn't actuarially sound. In other words, if it was invested and earning 10 per cent interest, it would save the government putting in perhaps as much money—

Mr. Stokes: Well, that makes good sense, doesn't it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Certainly, but I mean after all it is the government that is borrowing the money and we would be paying the interest on the money anyway. In other words, what I am saying is that it balances out. We either pay a lower interest rate, and we put X number of dollars into the fund, or we pay a higher interest rate here and put less money in from this side.

Mr. Stokes: But if it is more actuarially sound, it would be much better for the teacher.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, the amount that the teachers receive in payout or benefits is not being governed by the amount of interest or the amount of money in the fund. That has never been taken into account when the arrangements for benefits have been considered. The benefits have been improved over the years, but they are not related to the amount of money in the fund. In other words, if it became obvious as it did earlier this year to institute a new—what is known as the "ninety rule"—this has happened. And the pension is now based on the best seven years.

I suppose the Ontario Teachers Federation is talking to us about basing it sometime in the future on the best five years. But this will probably be considered unrelated to the interest the fund is earning, or the money in the fund, because this seems to be the way that it has worked over the years in this particular fund. We have considered the benefits unrelated to the actuarial soundness of the fund.

Mr. Foulds: Just one further point, and I want to underline it. I am not a mathematician, I am not an economist, I am not an accountant. So we are probably on equal terms here.

I think that the Ontario government borrowed, at nine per cent, from the New York teachers fund last year. And it just seems to me if the Ontario Treasury has to do that at one level, that the Ontario teachers are subsidizing the government treasury, when the interest is only six per cent. I know the government guarantees the fund. But every time it does make a special payment into the fund, the superannuation fund is castigated in the press. The press and the politicians are fond of saying that the government is unduly subsidizing the teachers. Surely we could and should strive toward putting the superannuation fund on an actuarially sound basis.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I want to get into a specific instance. I am not going to mention any names but—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Before the hon. member does, could I say, just to clarify what I said earlier, I understand that the six per cent interest applies to the money which has been previously invested. Last year's investment of about $172 million was invested at 8.57 per cent—which is what the government

is paying on it. This year's money will be not less than about 7.8 per cent, so we really are coming pretty close to this.

Mr. Stokes: I understand that you are going to draw again further from the fund about the first of November. Am I correct in saying it's about $40 million that you are going to borrow from the fund? And you are saying that will be at the new rate in excess of seven per cent?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you. All right.

I want to get into a specific instance of how a teacher was hard-pressed. This is a teacher in my riding who worked for something like 12 years with the Department of Indian Affairs as a teacher and then decided to transfer over to the Ontario school system. In total he has about 34 or 35 years in as a teacher.

This year he reaches the magical number, which is 90. But unfortunately, when he started to check he found out that he wasn't credited with any of the time that he had served as a teacher with the Department of Indian Affairs and that he would have to buy in. So I asked of people down here, what would this person have to do in order to buy in? The answer I get back—based on figures given by the actuaries of the fund—the note I get back says, "Hold your hat, Jack. I checked out what this person would have to pay into the teachers' superannuation fund in order to get credit for his 10 years' service with Indian Affairs. The amount would be $35,527.38."

No, that is no mistake. It is $35,527.38. This is another example of the little guy that puts me off about this fund. The principal beneficiary is the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) with his cheap source of money. Such a policy shows up when a guy like this teacher is told to get pension credit for 10 years during which he earned a total of $10,250. He has to pay $35,527.38.

The government of Ontario is more interested in having the money of guys like teachers, than it is in recognizing the service he and his kind render the community. This is the dilemma that faces a teacher who has, in total, about 35 years' service at a teacher, but in order to retire with full benefits—and of course he is prepared to buy back in at a reasonable rate in keeping with his salary or his earnings at that time you must realize that $35,000, which the actuary says he must pay in order to participate fully commensurate with his years of service as a teacher, is just outrageous.

I am wondering, has the minister come across many other instances of where this has worked an undue hardship on many teachers in the province? And is there any way that he is studying to ameliorate the situation for these teachers? This particular teacher, I think he is 59 years of age, has a serious disability. And it is very, very doubtful if he will ever be able to work in a classroom again. There is just no way he can come up with $35,000. And there is no way he can qualify for a full pension unless he buys back in because, I understand you don't qualify until you reach this magical figure of 90. I am wondering, has the minister given any consideration to assisting people who find themselves in this dilemma?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I haven't really had any instances like this brought to my attention. I can see that it would be a fair hardship on this person to try and pay back $35,000 now to gain his full pension. However, in asking him to do that, I think that they are taking into account the fact that other people in the fund, who have been in for that number of years, have put their money in. Over the years and to be fair to them, there has to be some actuarial basis of working out what a person pays back in order to gain the same benefits as someone who has paid in continually over that long period of time. While it may sound like a very unreasonable amount, it is probably an actuarially sound amount.

Mr. Stokes: I might just make an observation, and then you can comment on it. How many teachers now, even at the present rate, would contribute $1,000 out of their own money into the teachers' superannuation fund? And continue to do it for 35 years? That is precisely what they are asking this chap to do, over and above what he has contributed for what I would think would be a 25-year period.

You are probably talking about maybe $45,000 or $50,000 in total that he would have to contribute to the fund. And this is what he would have to do in order to qualify for a full pension, say at the end of this school year. I believe that these things have to be actuarially sound. But this seems to be an inordinately large amount of money for him to have to contribute at this particular point in time. This is in addition to his 25 years of contributions.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The only thing I could say, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps I can take a look at it and see. The commission has general ground rules upon which they have to operate and base their rules for paying back money, and I gather they have worked out a pension. He would be entitled to a pension based on his 25 years' service, wouldn't he?

Mr. Stokes: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes. The thing is worked out, as I understand it, on the difference between the pension he would get on his 25 years and on his 35 years—the difference in total pension plus some actuarial figure that is used. Thas is where they get the $35,000 from. It is not based on contributions.

As I have said here many times, I am not an actuary or an accountant and I don't know how they work this out. It does sound like a hardship, but I suppose it is the same kind of thing that occurs in the public service of Ontario when people also want to pay back into pension funds.

All I can suggest to the hon. member is that perhaps I can take a look at it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, a question of the minister: Has the department ever given any consideration to handling the teachers' superannuation fund in the same manner as the new bill that we passed last year regarding OMERS—Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement Service? As I remember, the interest paid to the fund there is tied to the rate that the government pays for money when the government borrows.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I answered that.

Mr. Good: You are not tied by legislation to the rate that the government pays, but the OMERS bill is. The legislation we passed last year ties the rate to the rate the government has to pay for outside sources of money.

The government of Ontario hasn't borrowed any money for over three years. My understanding is that the rate was then established by the amount of interest that Hydro had to pay over the past year. I think last year it was just a fraction over nine per cent, or a fraction under nine per cent, I am not quite sure. The government was tied to this as far as the OMERS fund was concerned.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Perhaps I could just read to the hon. member the section from the bill which this House passed last December. Section 4, subsection 5 of the bill says:

> The Treasurer shall issue from time to time a Province of Ontario debenture in the amount as determined by the commission of surplus funds accumulated in the fund and not required for current expenditures, such debenture to be for a term of not more than 25 years and not less than 20 years and to bear interest payable half yearly at a rate of interest not less than the weighted average yield to maturity of long-term securities issued or guaranteed by the province payable in Canadian dollars and sold to the public during the Province of Ontario fiscal year next preceding the date of the debenture.

As I indicated, there was money borrowed in this manner by the province at a rate of over eight per cent this year.

Mr. Chairman: Item 8 carried?

Mr. Good: Same as the OMERS bill.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2201 carried?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, there's just one point I wanted to say before this vote was carried. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville will be happy to know that we have the change in regulation prepared to take out the 20 days that he and other members of the House were concerned about, and that will be enacted very shortly.

Vote 2201 agreed to.

On vote 2202:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2202. Item 1.

Mr. B. Newman: Item 1?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. B. Newman: Vern, did you want to—

Mr. Singer: Yes, I want to talk about ETV. Can we deal with ETV here, Mr. Chairman? Or would the minister rather do it later? It's in this first vote.

Mr. Chairman: If it is in the first vote and it comes under item 1, we'll deal with it.

Mr. Singer: Yes. All right.

Mr. Chairman: Is that in, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh yes.

Mr. Singer: It's not called ETV any more. It's got a new name, Ontario Educational Communications Authority. That's the one.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1.

Mr. Singer: Six million, eight hundred and eighty-eight thousand dollars. Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm a little puzzled by this. Not only do we find it here, and I wasn't—

Mr. Foulds: At least you could find it in the vote.

Mr. Singer: I wasn't here when Colleges and Universities were discussed. But there's another $6 million there, so—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Would you like me to explain why first?

Mr. Singer: All right. Tell us why first, and then we'll ask you some questions on it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The reason that this money is here now is that COGP recommended the responsibility for the Ontario Educational Television Authority transfer from the Ministry of Education to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. And the implementation committee decided this should be done. We all agreed, and the responsibility for the agency has changed. My colleague, the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Kerr), is the one who has charge of that piece of legislation.

However, in the transfer, we became concerned, in the Ministry of Education, with the school component of the work of that authority, which used to be a branch of our department. In other words, our concern is with the development of programming for in-school use, for use in our elementary and secondary schools; and the transmission of the programming to the schools, and the producing of programmes.

When we sat down and looked at what had been done in past years in this branch, it looked like a little more than 50 per cent of their time and operation was concerned with the development of our major concern, that is programmes for elementary and secondary schools, as opposed to the general field of education television—which is another concern of theirs, and which is why it was basically changed to the other ministry. So we felt that there should be shown in our vote the amount of money which was necessary for us to have some continuing say in how that authority develops the programmes which are of concern to us, and to the school system of this province. Therefore, we have left that in there.

I am not sure that we have absolutely worked out the kind of ground rules which will guarantee that we still have some control over the kind of programming which will be done. I can tell you we think we have to sit down and do a little more work on that, and have a little more input from our department and some of the development of programming. But this is the kind of thing which should go on over the next little while. This is the reason the vote was split and this is why the $6.8 million is in here and the general responsibility is in my colleague's department.

Mr. Singer: It is another one of those cases where we get caught betwixt and between like we did in OISE.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Programme budget.

Mr. Singer: I know it sounds great, and you have all these learned people who give us reports one, two, three, four, five and six. And we have secretaries instead of cabinet ministers, and all sorts of staff and so on. But it makes it more than a little confusing, and almost impossible for the opposition to begin to cope with the kind of expenditures that are being made.

For instance, I have been looking just a bit at public accounts. And at last year's estimate. It seems, if I have looked at the right figures, that we have jumped from $3 million in 1970-1971 to $10.8 million in 1971-1972. And now in 1972-1973, we have $6.8 million here and $6 million in universities and colleges. So we are up to $2.8 million, or $13 million.

Perhaps at this point I may ask the minister if I am on the right track. Has the cost of the total effort, whoever is paying for it, whichever department it is allocated to, gone from roughly $3 million to $11 million to $13 million? Is that about right?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No. As I understand it, the first cost where there was so much in the estimate—I think that perhaps the total cost was more. I understand there was money drawn from the consolidated revenue fund in the first year. So it was, in fact, more. I will get that while you are talking.

Mr. Singer: All right: Now, what particularly concerns me is who controls it? Who tells us, or who can we ask, about whether or not the thing is being run economically? Because, I tell you quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, we have been receiving reports. My colleague from Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), who isn't here today, has received some hair-raising stories. Unfortunately, he can't be here today. You are going to be hearing about these very shortly; about instances

that have been reported to us of waste and extravagance in ETV that, if they are in fact true, would make one's hair stand on end.

That is why I find it so difficult, Mr. Chairman, to really determine, as these estimates go on—OISE was another example, and there are many others, I don't fault this minister—but I want to find out who is the boss. Who, in fact, can say: "I'm prepared to look into it." Or, "I have looked into it and there is waste and extravagance and we're going to stop it." Or, "Everything is under control and for the following reasons." When you get this split kind of responsibility that we see here, and listening to the minister's explanation, it is very difficult to say: "All right."

Let me give you one instance of the things I'm talking about and perhaps, after the supper hour we can divulge them. I'm told that there is an echo-editing system, whatever that might be, purchased in 1968 at a cost of $80,000 for the purpose of mechanizing the editing processes at ETV. The editors at the network, I am advised, were insufficiently trained in operating the system, or the system was faulty in its operation. But, whatever the cause may have been, ETV is still utilizing what is called a manual editing process and the $80,000 system is lying dormant.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the details of this. I have no idea what an echo-editing system is. I am presuming that our informant was, in fact, correct in the details that he gave to us. I would like to ask the minister, just for starters, is this the true story about the echo-editing sysem and, if so, why? Can anybody do anything about it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'll have to obtain that information for the hon. member. I can share his concern about wanting to know where he can get all this information, but as I say, I don't have the responsibility for this agency. We are supplying them with X number of dollars—

Mr. Singer: Seven million dollars.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —to do a job for us, but that doesn't entail us knowing whether they have this echo-editing machine which, I must admit, I don't know anything about either. But, perhaps, over the supper hour I can inquire and find out.

Mr. Singer: I have a series of those things, and I presume the minister is only going to be able to give me the same kind of response.

Mr. Stokes: A series?

Mr. Singer: Perhaps we could call it 6 o'clock and start again at 8.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Why don't you send me the list?

Mr. Singer: It depends what kind of—

Mr. Stokes: Go ahead, give him a chance.

Mr. Foulds: They are always complaining we don't give them anything over there.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1 carried?

Mr. Foulds: No, no.

Mr. Chairman: I'm just asking if there are any more speakers on item 1.

Mr. Stokes: There certainly are.

Mr. Singer: If you are not ready to call it 6 o'clock, I'll throw a couple more things at him.

Mr. Stokes: Give him your list.

Mr. Singer: I'm told, Mr. Chairman, that new positions were set up, apparently, for ETV just this year, which involved the hiring of eight assistant area supervisors for Toronto. The total cost of creating these eight new jobs will be approximately $300,000. This is the year, remember, where your department is putting a ceiling, or fixing costs, or doing something about grants to school boards which has involved a tightening of the belt and concern in the minds of many teachers whether they are going to lose their positions or new ones are not going to be hired.

What happened for these eight assistant area supervisors who are going to cost $300,000? Apparently they grabbed people out of the school system and gave them big promotions, amazing promotions from a financial point of view. I am also told that these people while they were quite happy to accept the new jobs and the increased salaries, really hadn't any idea of what they were supposed to do or why they were going to be there.

Mr. Chairman: It being 6 o'clock—

Mr. Singer: Now, the chairman tells me it is 6 o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 1, 1972

Action on securities reports, statement by Mr. Winkler 3043

"Prospects for the Lake Ontario region," statement by Mr. Winkler 3044

Political activity of chairman of OEC, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3044

Dismissal of director of ROM, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. Kerr: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis 3045

Niagara Escarpment task force, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 3047

Proposed takeover of Toronto company, question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 3048

Fire in OHC building, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Timbrell 3048

Conflict of interest, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3049

Pollution monitoring instruments, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Martel 3050

Interpretation of legislation, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Singer 3051

Pro-Con Consolidated Warehousing, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Bounsall 3052

Fire regulations for treatment centres, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Deacon 3052

Summer employment for students, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Spence 3053

Appointment of coroner for Nipigon area, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Stokes, Mr. Lewis 3053

Government participation in Renfrew county project, question of Mr. White: Mr. Yakabuski 3054

Role of municipalities in OHC developments, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Bounsall 3055

Ministry of Agriculture and Food Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 3055

Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1970, bill to confirm, Mr. Bales, first reading 3055

Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1970, bill to confirm, Mr. Bales, first reading 3055

Securities Act, 1972, bill intituled, Mr. Winkler, first reading 3055

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, continued 3055

Recess, 6 o'clock 3087

No. 78

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, June 1, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2202, item 1.

On vote 2202:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The minister, Mr. Chairman, was going to get me a little more detail on ETV.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we'll give the minister a chance to co-ordinate.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): My friend was going to ask about eight questions.

Mr. Singer: Well, I had a couple. Have you got answers to the first two? If you can answer the first two, we can move on from there.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, working from the last first. I can find no indication that there is any such person as an area superintendent in the—

Mr. Singer: Assistant area supervisor.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Assistant area supervisor. We can find no record of such persons. Now, if you want to give us some names of people, perhaps we can give you the right name of what they are. But those particular titles don't ring any bells with anyone here.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Have you got assistant area supervisors who make $38,000 each?

Mr. Singer: Could I interpret that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Even the chairman doesn't make that. We would be very much aware of people who made that kind of money.

Mr. Singer: I can get you the name before the evening is over, if the name of the individual is important. But I am advised that some eight very capable teachers out of the Toronto system were recently appointed to these new jobs. They come from a number of our important educational institutions here in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Stokes: I bet you Elwy Yost doesn't even make that much money.

Mr. Singer: They were doing quite well as senior teachers and department heads, and so on; and suddenly these vacancies became apparent. And as of the beginning of this year they were appointed. It may be that my informant had the wrong titles, but I am sure the story about the appointments was correct.

My informant advised me that they were appointed as assistant area supervisors for Toronto ETV. Now, it may be that there is a difference in nomenclature, but I have very good reason to believe this because I know the informant very well; and I certainly wouldn't be misled by this particular informant—that this kind of appointment was in fact made.

An hon. member: You can't be sure, though.

Mr. Singer: I don't know if the Toronto Board of Education does its own efforts in ETV, or whether this kind of appointment relates to the expenditure of the $6,888,000 that this minister asks for tonight; or the $6 million-odd that his colleague asks for. I would presume that it comes out of the $12,888,000. It may be that I haven't put exactly the correct title on it, but have there been a series of eight appointments that have been given to people out of the Toronto system that involve, in round figures, something like $300,000?

Hon. Mr. Wells: There were about eight or nine people taken into the authority.

Mr. Singer: These are probably the people that I was told about.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They were not working for the Toronto school board, or any board.

Mr. Singer: None of them were?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They were working for the Metropolitan Educational Television Association.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Yost was one?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A great fellow.

Mr. Singer: Was one of them not a department head at the Western Technical School?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't know. What was his name?

Mr. Singer: I didn't say his name. He was a department head at Western Tech, earning, as I am advised, about $20,000 to $22,000, who has now got a job that is worth $30,000 to $35,000.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that possible?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is certainly not this group.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister doesn't make that much.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The highest salary in this group was $19,500 and then there were three at $14,000, one at $11,000, one at $19,000; and then some of the lesser paid staff. But these were people who were working for the Metropolitan Educational Television Association; and then when it went out of business they came over.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That was a great authority.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: All right. Regardless of whether we are talking about exactly the same thing, can you tell me first of all what titles these people have? Secondly, why it is important for the people of Ontario, that we pay them salaries out of ETV?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They were on a lateral transfer.

Mr. Singer: Oh, a lateral transfer.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Their salaries are the same. And as I indicated one is an assistant superintendent of programming; one an executive producer; one a producer; one a project consultant; one a research officer; Mr. Yost is superintendent of regional liaison; one is a secretary and one is in the purchasing office.

Mr. Singer: What are these top-level people going to do?

An hon. member: They'll liaise—what do you think!

Hon. Mr. Wells: They're going to do the jobs I've just outlined.

Mr. Singer: Well, what are the jobs? Have you got job descriptions? And why did you have to grab them out of whatever they were doing?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We absorbed them because META closed down, and the total responsibility for the educational television operation, including Metro, is now assumed by the Ontario Educational Communications Authority.

Mr. Singer: Is the minister stating as a fact that none of these people were taken from the teaching profession in the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I am just saying that to the best of my knowledge right now—I don't think they were, but I'd have to doublecheck—if most of them were earning this kind of a salary from META in this kind of a capacity, they wouldn't have had any time to be a teacher. They may have been teachers before they got into these positions; some of them were, I am sure.

Mr. Singer: Is the minister suggesting the $300,000 figure that was given to me is wrong?

Hon. Mr. Wells: If it is to cover the salaries and so on of the people I am talking about, it is wrong.

Mr. Singer: The salaries of these people, plus their office equipment, plus their secretarial staff—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, it would seem that the figure is wrong, exaggerated.

Mr. Singer: All right. Then I would ask the minister again, as I asked him on an earlier question, if he would check very carefully? I will bring him back names, certainly within the next 24 hours, of some of the people involved. I am not satisfied yet as to what these people are going to do, but let's leave that one for the moment.

Can you tell me about the EECO editing system that I was talking about?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that they have an EECO electronic editor, which was bought for $36,000 in

1970, and that it is used to about 80 per cent of its capacity.

Mr. Singer: Is the minister not familiar with one that was bought in 1968 at a cost of $80,000?

Hon. Mr. Wells: There was no such—

Mr. Singer: I see. Would the minister say that it was untrue that the editors at the network were insufficiently trained in operating the system or that the system was faulty and in fact it really wasn't used? You wouldn't agree with that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am taking the advice of the general manager and chairman of the authority and he is disagreeing with that.

Mr. Singer: I can see his head shaking. I can interpret that too. I just want to get the minister on the record. We can't get the headshakes on the record; I would like to get the minister on the record. Would the minister not agree that—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Get the minister on the record, figuratively as well.

Mr. Singer: Yes, would the minister not agree that ETV is still utilizing a manual editing process?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would imagine they are.

This is a special editor, a computerized electronic editor for special situations, but I am sure—

Mr. Singer: Well, if you have a computerized electronic editing service, why would it be necessary to continue the use of the manual service?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would suspect, and I think I have got the assurance, it is because of the quantity of work. This is not a small operation; this is a large operation. Some of the things lend themselves to use on this special electronic editor, others are done in the normal way, depending on the speed with which it is to be done, the complexity of the task.

Mr. Singer: Would the minister not agree that this kind of expenditure—my informant advises me it was $80,000, the minister says $36,000; I haven't seen the invoices, so I don't know which figure is right—but that this kind of expenditure would have contemplated the replacement of the manual service with the electronic service?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It complements the manual service; it is part of the total editing operation.

Mr. Singer: All right. I have another question for the minister. I am told that in 1968 videotape editing costs ran approximately $100 an hour, and that a considerably larger amount is involved in the same process today. I am further advised that in 1965 three VTR units, whatever they may be, were purchased by ETV for internal use.

Mr. Foulds: VTRs are videotape recorders.

Mr. Singer: Oh, all right. I am further advised that these units are rarely used and, in addition, that ETV—or as it's now called the Ontario Educational Communications Authority—still requires the use of a private company to provide screening facilities for the network, and all editing processes are jobbed out by the Ontario Educational Communications Authority. Is that correct, or is that incorrect?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, it is not correct.

Mr. Foulds: It's not correct; your batting average is low—

Mr. Stokes: Who is your authority, Vern?

Mr. Singer: —then there is no truth in this at all?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No.

Mr. Singer: No. All right. Well, that's fine. As long as it's on the record. Because I have reason to believe that this information can and will be authenticated. And as long as the minister says that it isn't true, then we'll just go back and see the extent of the proof that's available.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You said that all editing is jobbed out, is that the word?

Mr. Singer: Well, all right, is the minister playing with words? How much of the editing is jobbed out? Is any?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, no. You said all the editing is jobbed out and I said that is not so. Now, I am sure that in the process of doing their operation, that some editing is jobbed out sometime.

Mr. Singer: All right, now. How much of the editing in relation to all of the editing that is done, is, in fact, jobbed out? Ninety per cent? Eighty per cent? Seventy per cent? Five per cent? How much?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Forty per cent.

Mr. Singer: Forty per cent. What were the figures in the most recent years? How much was paid for jobbing out and how much was done inside?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I think we'd have to get that information.

Mr. Chairman, I think I should draw to your attention that I think we are going beyond the normal consideration of the estimates for this department.

I'd be quite happy to talk about how we are going to spend that $6,880,000 and the kind of things that we're going to do. But you are starting to go back and talk about things that were bought in 1965—obviously not out of this estimate—and things that have been bought in the past, and so forth. I think that, under the normal course and rules of estimates, we should be talking about what we are going to spend this money on.

Mr. Singer: Well, I am very glad the minister put it in that context because this is exactly what I was getting at.

You are asking us for $12,888,000. You're asking for $6,888,000 and your colleague asked for another $6 million. We have suggested to you, and I suggest to you again, that there is no governmental control over this $12 million that, in fact, ETV is spending. We have had a number of complaints, and we have a reason to expect that tonight, when the minister is asking for approval of $6,888,000, that he is prepared to tell us why.

Our auditor can't tell us. Our auditor has failed miserably in trying to examine government expenditures. We have a series of complaints here about wastage of money in ETV; we have a reason to expect from this minister here in this House tonight that he tell us the kind of checking and examination that his department does in the whole control of ETV.

The minister first bowed out by saying, "Well, really I don't do it, and it's only here because a management consultant said split it up this way and split it up that way." But hearken to what's going on at the Public Accounts Committee, and watch the inability of the Provincial Auditor to tell us what, in fact, is going on.

Somewhere along the line, Mr. Chairman, we have the right to expect from the minister, some basis for the belief that this money is being properly spent. From the series of complaints we have had and from the inexact answers of the minister—he is being very cute, and I don't blame him. Maybe he doesn't know, and I am not saying that he has authorized bad expenditures.

I am saying that there is no supervision of this kind of expenditure by this department or by his colleague in University Affairs. I am saying that the members of this House and the people of the Province of Ontario are entitled to some explanation of a system of checks and balances.

Here you are into something new, and there are all sorts of allegations.

Whether they are exact in their final detail or not, I am satisfied that they are reasonably exact in that there is wastage and that there is lack of control. We're entitled to some explanation as to what this minister does about making sure that the money he is going to get voted tonight is going to be properly spent in 1972-1973, or is properly spent in 1971-1972, or properly spent in 1970-1971 when this ETV programme started. And the minister is unable to do that.

Somewhere along the line, Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to some answers from the responsible minister of government, which would indicate to us that he is in charge and he is in control and that the system just doesn't go on multiplying by itself.

Somewhere along the line, we are entitled to expect a definitive series of statements from this minister on how all this money is being spent and what system of controls we have. Not just that we're adding new jobs upon new jobs; not just that a bunch of technicians or a bunch of so-called experts are wasting the public money. When you are cutting down on the various school boards throughout the province, we want to have some explanation and some reason for the fact that you are not ploughing the money in somewhere else.

I am not satisfied with anything the minister has said. I don't think the people of Ontario are going to be satisfied. I think it is the responsibility of the minister, here and now, to tell us how he controls ETV. What kind of reports he gets? Who are his managing people? Is he satisfied that what is being spent is necessary? Is he satisfied that we are getting the best value for our money? This is new and it is different and the allegations of wastage are substantial.

You have read some of them. You have read about this man. You've read about the

affidavit that was produced in relation to Mr. Lorch. I haven't mentioned Lorch tonight. I was hoping that my colleague from Sarnia would be back. But you have read about that affidavit and you have read the history of it.

We want to know why it was necessary that someone in ETV, some lawyer in ETV, drafted an exculpatory affidavit that Lorch was forced to swear before they would give him $2,500. That's the kind of explanation that we expect from the minister. In the absence of it, all we can conclude is that the minister, as facile as he may be in avoiding the exact terminology of the questions I've hurled at him, is avoiding the issue.

You are asking for $12.8 million and you have given us no rational explanation at all of how you are controlling the expenditure of this money or that the people of the Province of Ontario are getting value for the dollar spent.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I am very satisfied with the results that I see from the Educational Television Authority. I see here a total increase in budget this year of 18 per cent, an increase that was fully scrutinized by the Management Board and the Policy and Priorities Board and the cabinet of this government. The 18 per cent increase in budget is going to allow for a 25 per cent increase in output which, I think, is a very good achievement. In other words, this year we are going to increase our number of hours of broadcasting from 4,400 to 5,400 hours on Channel 19 which is certainly recognized—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You can't get that in Brantford.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): You don't get that in Rainy River, either.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —as the most Canadian television station in Canada and of which, I think, we can be very proud.

Mr. Singer: That's very good! The best Canadian station in Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: When I'm asked to look at what I am getting for this money, I look at things like the total number of estimated viewings by students of the kind of programmes that have turned out here. I see that in elementary schools from 1969-1970 to 1970-1971, it went up from 18 million to 29 million.

Mr. Singer: A captive audience who have no choice and you know that.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Nuts!

Hon. Mr. Wells: In secondary schools, it went up from 2.6 million to 4.5 million. Your friend, the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman), asked me the other day, "What are we doing? Have we forgotten about this new media, educational television?"

Certainly, there is going to be more money spent on educational television if we do what your leader just suggested and get this out into areas where Channel 19 isn't now reaching. That will have to be one of the objectives of this programme. We are reaching far more French-speaking students.

Channel 19, in its total programme, which isn't my responsibility but my friend's, the Minister of Colleges and Universities, is increasing the number of adults who view it at one time or another from 157,000 in November, 1970, to 257,000 in November, 1971, to the figure for March, 1972: 267,500. This is an all-Canadian television station which I think is doing a job. It is able to produce school broadcasts, school programmes, educational programmes, that are eagerly wanted by our friends south of the border; Canadian programmes produced in Canada by Canadians and they want them down south of the border. This to me suggests that we are getting some kind of value for our money.

Mr. Stokes: How much do you sell those for?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Over the long haul we could get anywhere from about $300,000 to seven million dollars or more for those programmes.

Mr. Singer: How much have you made on them?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We haven't made anything yet on them, but we are going to make money on them over the long haul.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is the kind of thing, though, that we are doing here. You talk a lot about let's have Canadian enterprises, let's have something Canadian that is developing Canada and giving us a chance to put forward something truly Canadian. Here is our venture into this whole field and I think it is very significant.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask two things. The minister's facts and figures are most impressive on the surface. He says over the long haul we could make

between $300,000 and several million. He admitted, in answer to the interjection from my friend here from Thunder Bay, that he hadn't sold a thing. So it is like the fellow who sits down with pencil and paper and says, "My goodness, what a great business I am in. If everybody buys my swimming pool, or whatever I have got to sell, I am going to be a multi-millionaire 91 times over." But we haven't sold a single thing!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, we have sold the $300,000 worth. We are guaranteed that. We can't get any less than that.

Mr. Singer: How much did it cost us to produce the $300,000 thing that we sold?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh, well it cost us a lot more, but look at the significance of getting Canadian-produced programmes by Canadians into the United States. Now let's give them a chance to sell them.

Mr. Singer: Even if it costs us 10 times more than what we realize in revenue, that is very significant. If we produce something for $3 million and sell it for $300,000, we are certainly moving ahead, because this is a great Canadian enterprise. I would suggest that the minister has a very fine business approach to making money for the people of Ontario.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Give them something like Jalna.

Mr. Foulds: Did you get that? He says he doesn't like Jalna.

Mr. Singer: The significance is the important thing, not the dollars that we tax the people of Ontario. But it is significant that we sold $300,000 worth, and if the minister has any figures as to how much it cost us to sell the $300,000 worth I would be interested. I would guess it cost us $3 million to produce that. I am particularly interested in two things, Mr. Chairman. Number one is the system of checking. If this minister is responsible for the $6,880,000 he is going to be responsible for this year, what basis does he have to come to the conclusion that this money is being properly spent? Who reports to him, to what extent does he analyse the complaints, to what extent does he have management consultants come in, to what extent does he get daily, weekly, monthly, bi-monthly reports? Does he have any idea what happens in ETV after he gets this estimate through the House?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, my responsibility here is to take that money, and just as I might purchase something from the National Film Board or the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, in this case it is the Ontario Educational Communications Authority. I have people in my curriculum development branch who work in a liaison capacity and who help develop these programmes. I want to see in my responsibility here is the kind of programmes that are turned out, how they are used and what the response is in the school, based on the kind of viewers and the kind of reactions to them.

As I told my hon. friend this afternoon, the reporting responsibility is to my colleague the Minister of Colleges and Universities, and there is a board appointed under the legislation. They are responsible for the day-to-day operation, in turn reporting to him, and it is his responsibility to do these things that you have indicated.

My responsibility is to see that this authority, for the money we put in, turns out the kind of product that we want to be used in the schools of this province, the elementary and secondary schools, and that we are doing. And we are going to do it in an even better way, because we are going to build up even better methods of co-ordination to make sure that we have our say in developing the programmes and in helping to produce them. That is our responsibility in this operation.

Mr. Singer: I think it would be a reasonable summary of what the minister says, Mr. Chairman, to say that as long as we vote $6,880,000 he really has no responsibility to see what happens to $6,880,000 after it leaves him, that he has no responsibility for supervising it. We can't depend on him. Maybe we can depend on his colleague, the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Certainly we can't depend on the Provincial Auditor. And if there is any validity in any of these allegations of waste, extravagance and uselessness, then this minister isn't going to dig it out by himself. Let's leave that one, because we come into a very distinct clash of opinion. I say that the checking on this kind of government expenditure is non-existent. Tell me about Mr. Lorch? Tell me about the allegations made by Mr. Lorch?

Mr. Chairman: I think that question is out of order.

Mr. Singer: Why is it out of order?

Mr. Chairman: Because we are not studying the public accounts of this province.

Mr. Singer: No, no.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. Order. We are studying the estimates.

Mr. Singer: I'm not talking about the public accounts. I'm talking about—

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member is always out of order, whether in committee or in this House. He is always out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Well, let's hear him and I'll decide.

Mr. Singer: Look. I have the public accounts here. There is nothing in the index that says anything about Lorch at all. Look at it. It isn't there.

Mr. Lawlor: That is the trouble.

Mr. Yakabuski: Put him down, Mr. Chairman, don't let him ramble on.

Mr. Singer: I'm talking about an allegation that was publicly made by a former employee of ETV who says he was forced to sign an affidavit saying ETV was fine—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. It has nothing to do with the estimates.

Mr. Singer: Oh, it has, it has.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Have some respect for the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order please.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it has to do with ETV.

Mr. Chairman: Order please, we are dealing with the estimates for 1972-1973.

Mr. Singer: Oh, Mr. Chairman, it is traditional in dealing with the public accounts of the province that we can call a minister to account for what has happened in relation to government expenditures.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Don't let him go on—

Mr. Yakabuski: Don't let him put you down.

Mr. Chairman: I rule the discussion out of order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, you can rule the discussion out of order but I am entitled to discuss this. And if you want to call the Speaker in and get his ruling, I'm quite prepared to—

Mr. Chairman: No. No need to call the Speaker in.

Mr. Singer: —let you do it. I am entitled, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Yakabuski: You are just being a naughty boy.

Mr. Singer: —to ask this minister to explain it and you can pound your gavel. The only way I will abide by this is if you call the Speaker in. I say you are wrong. I am entitled to ask this minister how he spends his money and to explain a particular incident relating to the functions of this department and the expenditure of his kind of money.

Mr. Yakabuski: Will the Leader of the Opposition speak to his naughty little boy?

Mr. Singer: Now if the Chairman wants to call in the Speaker, he can call him in and let's get his ruling.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. Order. We are not going back into—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, we are not going back. We are talking about the responsibility, and it is traditional in the British parliamentary system to allow us to discuss how public moneys have been handled. In relation to the particular case of Lorch, I am entitled to ask these questions—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How about some respect for the Chair?

Mr. Singer: —and I am going to ask them.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. Singer: All right if you want to challenge my right then call the Speaker in and let's get a ruling.

Mr. Chairman: We are not calling, Mr. Speaker in.

Mr. Singer: Well then I am going to continue.

Mr. Chairman: You are out of order.

Mr. Singer: Call the Speaker in. That's the only ruling that I'll abide by, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: Call the Sergeant.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You don't need a new leader—you need new members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to ask these questions and I'm going to persist in asking them. There is a tradition and there is a method of having me ruled out of order, and I'm not prepared to accept your ruling. The only way you can challenge me on that is to call the Speaker in. Call in the Speaker. Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Chairman doesn't have to challenge you.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to ask the minister how this has been dealt with and I am going to persist in asking him. And I am going to persist in asking him for an explanation.

Mr. Yakabuski: There is no one in the press gallery, Vern.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. We are studying the estimates for 1972-1973. It is all right to refer to something providing you relate it to these estimates, but to go into detail—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex Kent): Right on.

Mr. Singer: I am relating to the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! To go into details of something past and ask for a detailed explanation of events of the past—

Mr. Singer: Oh, Mr. Chairman, you are suddenly reading rules off the top of your head.

Mr. Gilbertson: Sit down!

Mr. Singer: Every member who gets up here is entitled to bring his grievances at the time of estimates in regard to particular cases.

Mr. Chairman: In relation to the estimates, yes.

Mr. Singer: Well certainly. Now let me explain it again, Mr. Chairman. There was a man named Lorch who was employed by ETV. Lorch has claimed in the press that an affidavit was forced from him in order that he could collect $2,500, and in the affidavit he had to have a clause in it saying: "Any criticism I ever made of ETV was wrong and I'm sorry and they are all a great bunch." Now I would like the minister to explain that process and why officials of ETV, particularly solicitors in that department, forced that affidavit before Lorch was paid $2,500?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I think that, as my friend knows, the responsibility for the Ontario Educational Communications Authority rests with the Minister of Colleges and Universities. The question was asked of him, and it was answered in committee a few days ago.

I think that that is the way that the matter should be handled. He holds the responsibility for this group. What I am willing to discuss all night with the member is what we are going to spend the $6,880,000 for next year. Under our new responsibility we are asking for this money to buy the programming for elementary and secondary schools. But the general discussion about things that have gone on in the authority, I submit Mr. Chairman, came within the gambit of the estimates of colleges and universities, and was indeed discussed there.

Mr. Chairman: Well, if it is not within this department it cannot be discussed.

Hon. Mr. Wells: And that minister will deal with it.

Mr. Singer: If this minister can't answer it, well he can't answer it. That's fine.

Hon. Mr. Wells: My colleague answered it.

Mr. Singer: It's never been discussed in this House, and it's never been answered by a responsible minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West? The member for Port Arthur?

Mr. Foulds: We are on item 1 are we, of vote 2202, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, item 1, 2202.

Mr. Foulds: The previous discussion has somewhat confused me. I'd like to talk initially about curriculum development in general, and I don't particularly at this point want to talk specifically about the Ontario Educational Communications Authority. There are a number of areas that I want to get into specifically in a few moments, but that will be a part of the ongoing discussion that we will have on this item.

It seems to me that the curriculum de-

velopment area is probably the most important single item in the whole vote that we will take in the Department of Education. It seems to me that this is one area where we must have constant review. I asked in my opening remarks, and the minister promised to get for me, a list of the people on the curriculum development committee, and how they were appointed, and what sort of representation they had. And I think I asked a supplementary question about the minister's opening statement where he said the curriculum development committee applied only to the primary level.

I'd like to know if we are thinking about development committees on the senior elementary level, the secondary level, and so on. I wonder if I could just pause there—does the minister have the information at his disposal?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the cyclical review formula which we have begun, the one that we have announced now, and is under way, is for the primary and junior grades from 1972 to 1974.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The next one that will be undertaken very shortly will be the intermediate, and then from 1973 to 1975; and then the senior, from 1975 to 1977. This is the process. By the time we are finished the senior, you are back around to start on the primary and junior again. Now, there are 55 members on the general committee on primary and junior. I don't know whether you want all the names, or do you want me just—

Mr. Foulds: I wonder if you could supply me with that information.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We can send you all the names over there.

Mr. Foulds: Fine.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask the minister concerning a report and a study conducted by the Ontario Human Rights Commission on teaching prejudice in schools.

Now the minister knows the findings of the human rights commission on this important topic. I would like to ask the minister, at this time, if any steps have been taken toward the elimination of a lot of this prejudicial material that was contained in Ontario textbooks, as reported by the Ontario Human Rights Commission in its report.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, we have a joint committee now, of Dr. Hill, and the human rights commission, plus Mr. Wiseman and Mr. Nelson of our department, working on this very matter. We are very concerned about this in our curriculum development, and have been meeting in order to try and correct some of the things that were found in the study.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Minister, how long has the committee now been meeting?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They have been meeting about six months.

Mr. B. Newman: They have not submitted any type of interim report as yet, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's an ongoing process. They are not working to present one report; they are an on-going working committee. They are looking for instance, at books as they are submitted in for approval to see if they still exhibit some of the questionable things which were identified in that study. They are continuing this job on an ongoing basis.

Mr. B. Newman: I would assume that they report periodically to the minister through some officials of his department. I would like to ask the minister if the department plans on developing guidelines for publishers and authors to prevent the use of inadequate and biased textbooks in the future.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, we work with publishers almost weekly on this issue. As they develop their textbooks, they are in close touch with our department, Mr. Crosley and others in the curriculum area.

Mr. B. Newman: Have you any specific guidelines laid down that they must follow or are they always on an ad hoc basis and on the individual text basis?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, we haven't any absolute guidelines. We are not trying to operate as censors. We are trying to operate in the area of taste and what is in good taste; that is in the spirit of what we are trying to do. We are not trying to say, "This is what you cannot do and if you do it it will be taken out." It is a process of working with them to ensure that the kind of things we don't want in the textbooks, don't get in.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would the minister care to name any one specific book on which the department has been responsible for changing the approach used by the author?

Mr. Singer: He cannot think of one right now probably—

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is the kind of question which would be unfair to some of the publishers and authors. It might be very unfair to them to suggest that in their initial drafts and discussions with us, our people perhaps found there was some bias that they, perhaps, did not even know and were quite willing to correct. I think the main thing is that the job is being done and, hopefully, the books are coming out without this kind of bias in them which apparently was there at one time.

Mr. B. Newman: I can accept the minister's statement that there is no need, really, to mention any specific book. How many times, in the six-month lifespan of the committee, have they actually made suggestions either to the author or to the publishers to delete or revise certain portions of the text?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Perhaps a couple of dozen times in the six-month period, mostly to the publisher.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I pursue this a bit? How are the suggestions made to the publishers or to the author? Are they simply made verbally or are they given specific written instructions that they must do so and so?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is a verbal process, in which they sit down together and discuss the text. It is all done verbally.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the minister, are they private meetings or are there minutes and records kept to show that this recommendation or suggestion was made to a specific author or publisher and that they have, in their wisdom and at the suggestion of the department, made specific changes?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, there are no minutes. They are just discussions in the form of private meetings with the publishers with perhaps the authors taking part, too, and discussing the various things and carrying on. There are no minutes kept.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, how would one know that your four officials who are supposed to be looking into this are actually doing anything whatsoever if there are no records kept of any sort?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I know because I have faith in the people we have asked to do this process. I have faith that they believe in what they are doing and I believe that they are attempting to get at this problem and eliminate it. I think that's the spirit we want to develop in this kind of field. We are not trying to censure. We are trying, in an atmosphere of cooperation with everyone in this field, to try to remove these biases. I think that we are doing it in the right way.

Mr. B. Newman: It is all right for the minister to say that, but what proof would anyone have that this is actually happening, other than what is being said here now, that this does happen? Unless it is actually recorded and documented somewhere, Mr. Chairman, we could also assume that nothing is being done.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As they say, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The proof then comes when the book is ready for general use and our evaluation. During our evaluation of a book to go on the approved list, it goes out to various groups. We send them to ethnic groups and to other groups. If we find they are coming back with indications that bias is in those books, then we will know that the committee hasn't been doing a job. In that way, we will be able to have an evaluation of the committee's work. So far, we haven't had any indication in their work of anything like that.

Mr. B. Newman: Then I would assume that the department does have copies of the book before publication or before any changes were made and also after the changes were made, so that someone could go along and check to see that these biases have been omitted, rather than have to thumb through or read through the whole book and study its contents to see if the bias is still there?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No. The evaluation that I talked about is done after the book has been published and before it is put on our approved list.

Mr. B. Newman: Okay. Then the changes are made actually before the book is published. The changes are made in the author's text and, after these changes are made, then it is published and is accepted and put on the prescribed list by the department. Am I right?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The discussions with this committee about whether there is any bias or not are done at the manuscript stage before it is published. Any evaluative procedure with various community groups, ethnic groups, etc., is done after the book has been printed. As I say, if it then turns out that the book does exhibit bias at that time, that will show me that the committee process has not been working. I haven't had any indication of that brought to my attention to this point.

Mr. B. Newman: Then the book would not be accepted. Am I right in concluding that? If the bias had not been eliminated, the minister and his officials would not accept it.

May I ask the minister then, does his department plan any further studies to assess the treatment of sub-cultures in our society, such as the poor, women, trade unionists, and political minorities, to see if biases exist in the various areas that I have mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The head of the women's bureau in the Department of Labour is on this committee, too. Through this process, I think, we are working towards something. We may not have reached perfection yet; but we think through this process we can arrive at some better state than we are at now.

Mr. B. Newman: There are certain types of bias readily found in a book that probably can be corrected a little easier, but there are other types of bias that may take a little more closer scrutiny and a little more delving. We hope that the two members from the Department of Labour and the two from the minister's department scrutinize the books as carefully as possible in an attempt to eliminate all types of bias.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member realizes, though, that we are talking probably about areas where he and I, and everyone in this House, recognize bias, but there is a grey area of taste and there is a grey area where I may think it is bias and the member may not. So, it is not as easy and simple a job as we might think sometimes, and it isn't absolutely black and white all the time.

Mr. B. Newman: That is right, Mr. Chair man; it just can't be black and white and the minister's opinion concerning bias could definitely be different from mine. Coming from a minority group, I would naturally have maybe a little different opinion, but I would hope that I would be broad-minded enough to accept a lot of this.

May I ask the minister, then, also if any studies are undertaken as to the effect of textbooks on personality development, primarily in the extremely young? I understand that a study has been conducted concerning children's textbooks and personality development. The study shows—if I may point out to the minister at this time—that the analysis of the sex role imagery found in a selection of elementary school textbooks has provided some evidence to support the contention that children tend to receive a rather traditional image of the female role in society.

References which are made to male and female figures repeatedly emphasize the role of the woman as a housewife and a mother, and a career is rarely ever part of the woman's world. The female is usually a figure in the background; she rarely shines through as the heroine in the story, or, for that matter, she doesn't seem to harbour any admirable qualities. A woman's creative and intellectual potential are undermined.

However, it is a well known fact that she can cook, clean, sew and give advice, protection and comfort to the children. The only other function she may assume is that of a school teacher, nun or a secretary.

Now, in contrast to all of this, the male is portrayed as a dynamic, versatile, talented and adventurous type of individual, who can and does assume numerous social roles. He is often the central character of the stories, and his entire world seems to be so much more interesting than that of the woman.

Now, these studies certainly do indicate to the youngster or child, that it downgrades the woman and upgrades the male; and it may have some effect on personality development.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that the points my hon. friend makes are interesting ones and valid ones. I hope he isn't suggesting a reversal of the process, but rather a balancing. Certainly we wouldn't want to have the male downgraded from a dynamic, versatile, talented person. But certainly talking with the young female students of today, I am not quite inclined to believe that the textbooks that they have studied and the materials that they have used are developing the kind of feeling that the member has pointed out here. I am sure he knows, knowing his close association with schools, just as I go out to many schools and talk to them, that there aren't too many of the girls in school today who feel the way he

has indicated. They perhaps might feel it from reading other books such as that.

Most of them today, I think, are very well aware of the much expanded role of the woman in society. The business and professional women have been in to see us a couple of times regarding our textbooks; and I think one of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women was that textbooks should be studied in this particular regard. We are certainly doing that as part of our review of textbooks.

Mr. B. Newman: May I point out to the minister that this isn't my report? This is a report of a study of 30 books that were analyzed and these are the conclusions that were drawn from the analysis of these 30 textbooks. They point out that the female has been downgraded and the male supergraded, so to speak; and we would prefer to find a nice balance in this world.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Do you agree that it has that effect on the young children who read the books?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, I think it does to a certain point, Mr. Minister, very much so.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I certainly don't get that feeling from my kids.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, I made the mistake of pausing while the minister replied to a question when I was in the full flight of my remarks; and I'd like to resume them. However, to start with I would like to pick up briefly this question of not teaching prejudices of the schools. I think this is probably the most difficult area that we have to deal with. Quite frankly, I would not like to see bias edited out of textbooks to the extent that it became intellectual pablum. Because surely one of the things that we have to be constantly aware of is that it is almost impossible for any single one of us to eliminate our biases or prejudices. What we have to do is to make sure that they are balanced. And, in fact, there have been some good curriculum developments in this very area, in some of the courses that have been under development for the last four or five years.

Mr. Stokes: Do you believe that?

Mr. Foulds: I think it can be very illustrative for a class to read a statement by Garfield Weston about the blacks in South Africa, that is rather denigrating, in conjunction with teaching a novel such as "Cry The Beloved Country." I think the thing to do is to establish the balance.

Also I think it is important that we don't begin to strive for what was sort of an ideal in education about four or five — longer ago than that I'm afraid, about 8 years ago. That we be objective; because neutrality can often reach the proportions of eunuchism, if you like. We have nothing of strength—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Eunuchism? That is very serious.

Mr. Foulds: Well, the hon. member might know. I don't at the present moment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is no cure, I understand.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to continue some remarks about the development of curriculum, because I think it is important not only to keep the mix that I was talking about in terms of bias and interpretation—

An hon. member: That is a racial remark if ever I heard one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You see he is prejudiced. He doesn't like the Micks. He doesn't want to keep the Micks?

Mr. Foulds: You don't like the mix? It sounds like an anti-Western remark?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, it's Tom?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, right. Or it has to do with certain other activities that go on on social occasions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You may have to correct Hansard in this regard.

Mr. Foulds: You may have to expunge Hansard.

Seriously, I think that we should be looking constantly at development in intradiscipline areas. I think that we also have to look at development of curricula between elementary and secondary schools. I think one of the healthy directions that we have been taking is the idea of a continuous education from K to 13; and I've talked about that earlier.

But whether we like it or not, there is that unnatural break which still occurs in the structure of the system between the end of elementary school and the beginning of

secondary school. I think one of the most difficult curriculum areas to knit together, and to make a natural flow, is that between elementary and secondary levels.

I think that is where we get to a point that I would like to discuss with the minister. I mentioned it in my opening remarks. That is the time that is necessary to develop curricula properly. And if we are going to do this on a decentralized local level we need the time for the teachers, and those involved at that level. It seems to me, if we are going to make use in our curriculum development of our community resources and of our community people, once again we need time.

I am extremely disappointed, in this exchange that we are having in the House, that there aren't one or two representatives from the government party who could aid us in contributing to the discussion. The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith), for example, who is an elementary schoolteacher in background could, I think, have made a valuable contribution.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Too bad he isn't here tonight.

Mr. Foulds: That's right.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): That's wrong.

Mr. Foulds: That's correct, I should say. And the member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell). I think when we are discussing curricula it seems to me we isolate that, as we have continued to do under these votes, and eliminate that from a connection with the structure of the system and even the structure of our facilities.

It also troubles me that even now there is a quantitative limit put on certain courses.

Mr. Stokes: One hundred and forty miles round trip.

Mr. Foulds: As I recall, about a year ago—

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): That figures, 70 and 70.

Mr. Foulds: —or three years ago, I was developing courses in English at the grade 13 level. When it came down to a question of whether the subject was worth one credit or two credits, there was an hour's time limit. You had to have, I believe, something like 112 hours for the subject to be accepted as a credit. That seems to me to be defeating the purpose of some of the ways by which we want to break open the system.

Surely the important thing is the quality of the work that is done. The students, presumably, at that level should be engaged in a good deal of research on their own, in essay writing. The number of classes they have or, the number of periods and the minutes of the periods they have is not one of the main criteria we should use for judging the validity of the course.

I think, as I have said, that one of the problems we face in curriculum development is that it doesn't happen in isolation. It happens with regard to the physical plant and it happens with regard to the structure of the departments in the school. For example, you can't develop a movie appreciation course or a course in mixed media unless you have a very simple thing, blackout drapes. That may seem like an obvious statement—and it is—but I have worked in a school where we didn't have things like blackout drapes.

That's not the responsibility of the department, I realize. What I'm trying to do is emphasize the point that you don't develop curricula in isolation. You develop them in relation to the physical plants in which we work and the structure of the organizations in which we work.

It seems to me that we could discuss this under the architecture vote but I was going through a series of clippings on education from a number of the major dailies in the province over the past six months and it seems to me that there are a number of healthy experiments. What I am interested in, in terms of curricula experiments, is making them a permanent part of the system and making sure that we don't fall victim to mere fadism.

I think, for example, there is a place in our system for so-called SEED schools and that style of education. I think this is one of the places where curricula cannot be thought of in isolation; it comes down to a matter of style in terms of the options that we were talking about earlier.

We do have a number of options at the subject level. What we have to do in curricula development, it seems to me, is carry that over to a number of alternatives in the styles of education. This is one of the reasons —and one of the most important reasons— that I said in my opening remarks there is a place, surely, in our system for such traditional subjects as Latin.

What we don't want to get into, it seems to me, at this stage in our educational development and curricula development, is we

don't want to jump on or accelerate the so-called progressive types of education.

What we want is what I've referred to as the "mix" earlier. The trap that we've often fallen into, it seems to me, is to assume that progressivism is soft and we're getting a kind of a reaction against that today—and that traditionalism is hard and difficult.

It seems to me that we have to develop a system that takes into account these various types of education. For example, the traditional type of education, that people think of as being difficult, can be easy in the sense that they set a standard of their own. Often very capable students aren't challenged enough, and the most gifted students get very good results in that system. But, in objective terms, they don't get the results that they really should be achieving.

Similarly, a progressive system can be just as tough, in terms of making demands on the individual. It seems to me that what we have to do here is develop and continue to develop the courses that we are developing. Add some. I've noticed courses in ecology being suggested by high school students in Toronto. But what we have to get to—and we can get to this later on in this vote, it seems to me—is offering a genuine set of alternatives in curricula so that the individual who feels more comfortable in the so-called "hard" areas will take those. And those that feel more comfortable and can better profit from the creative development curricula, will take those.

Surely we've seen enough in the last 10 or 15 years, where we've responded, for example, the Robarts system—the consolidation of the schools, and we did that in good faith. We consolidated the schools so that there would be more subject offerings to a larger number of students. We've begun to learn that certain of the student's learning experiences go by the board when we do this. When you have to bus long distances—as they do in my area up to 35 miles, and I believe in the area of my colleague from Thunder Bay riding, as much as 70 miles.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): One hundred and forty miles round trip.

Mr. Foulds: Or 140 miles round trip. Certain learning experiences are lost to the student because he's on the bus so much of the time—

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Sounds like George Wallace.

Mr. Foulds: Oh, that was an unkind remark. That was a racial remark, if I've ever heard one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is just the beginning.

Mr. Foulds: Perhaps in curricula development, we have to be very conscious of the limitations of our present structures. I've had students fall asleep in the afternoon because they're tired—

Mr. Ruston: Oh, that doesn't speak very well—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: —just as the hon. members here often do.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I have seen the hon. member for Lakeshore sort of dozing.

Mr. Foulds: But who could blame the kid who got up at six o'clock in the morning, rode for an hour and a half, or two hours, on the bus; by two o'clock in the afternoon he needed a nap. A nap was more valuable to him than my class. Not very much doubt about that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We won't debate it at this time.

Mr. Foulds: And the experiences were gained in the total number of options opened to him in the curricula. But a loss in terms of learning outside of school was experienced by those students.

It seems to me that we should, in the development of the curricula, take a hard look at some decentralization, both in structures and in the formation of the curricula. One of the things that bothers me just slightly about the curricula development committees is that it seems to me they are trying to develop curricula for the entire province, and it may be that certain courses will work regionally rather than provincially. I would hope that the curricula development people will look into those areas.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for his remarks because I think they're very well-thought-out remarks concerning curricula. They're, of course, very much along the lines that we certainly are attempting to do within the ministry today.

As to his last point about the curricula committees and the development of curricula guidelines for the whole province, I indicated I would send him a list of the committee—

there are 55 people on the master committee. This again is to ensure that you have diversity, with all segments, areas, regions, different viewpoints, different people — all represented on these committees. They meet in sub-committees and then go back to the full committee at certain times.

But the idea is to develop a course guideline that will be of such general value that from it, when it gets out into all areas of the province, those people can then work to develop within these guidelines the kind of curricula that they want in their own area—one that is uniquely peculiar to their particular area.

I think this has got to be the way it's done and this is certainly what we emphasize. I know the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned many times that perhaps we're naive if we think teachers get much say in a lot of this. Perhaps they don't in a lot of the areas, but certainly we would hope that school boards—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I am sorry then. I got the impression that you thought that some teachers in this province didn't have too much say in curricula or textbook choice.

An hon. member: Oh, textbooks. You don't want to talk about that, do you?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is all part of the total process. Anyway I am sure that he agrees with me that they should be involved. We want to encourage teachers, students and others to have some input in developing a uniquely peculiar curriculum for each different area of the province. Certainly we would support the viewpoint of diversity and different approaches within each school district.

Certainly I think that the division school boards were a step forward. I think that they were the only way that we could bring equality of educational opportunity to the province over the long haul. I am not going to say that we have absolute equality at this time. Of course we know that isn't so. But we are working toward equality and we certainly have it to a much greater degree than we had two or three or four years ago.

Through grouping smaller boards and getting more resources into their hands and by us giving them the wherewithal to be able to develop more resources and more backup, they were able to do those things that some of the larger, wealthier boards have done for many years.

That doesn't necessarily mean that they have to practice consolidation to the greatest extent possible. There is still very much leeway for a division board to measure within its own area and to make sure that a certain school may have to stay open, even though it may not look like a particularly economic operation, because of the benefit that it has to that community. But it is up to that central board.

Now perhaps I'm looking for the ideal, that this board will be able to judge all situations as to the best interests of the students and others concerned. Perhaps it doesn't always happen, but certainly that is the way we think it should happen.

I think those boards will have to measure whether busing is a benefit, whether the benefits of busing a student to a school where he can get a great variety of curricula —and choice of courses outweigh the fact that he has to sit in that bus three-quarters of an hour on the way to school and three-quarters of an hour back and perhaps have to give up some of the extracurricular activities he would normally have.

They are going to have to decide that, but I think the point is that he now has that opportunity. He's got the opportunity within his own area to have this expanded educational opportunty, and I think that is good.

Certainly within each system there should be plenty of room for experimentation, and I think perhaps we as a department become too concerned that every time we find a new system we want everybody to conform to it.

This is the greatest problem in education, I think: We see something, a few people write about it, we go to a few conferences, a couple of panels say this is just the greatest thing and everybody has got to get it, so the next year everybody wants open classrooms.

I think there are great advantages in some situations for the open-classroom technique, but it may not be the ultimate answer for all children in all schools—there is still a place for the regular classroom too. I think I'm most impressed when I see a school that's got perhaps one floor of open classrooms and perhaps another floor of regular classrooms, so again we are able to have a diversity.

But the big problem is that too often we all run off with a new idea and think it is the ultimate, it's going to be the best improvement possible and we all should have

it and we should all do it. However, this isn't always the case.

I'm very pleased with some of the things that I see happening. For instance, in York county I see that they are establishing a new secondary school where they are going to put far greater emphasis on discipline and some of the "old" ways of running schools—they may even put the strap in there—because there are students who want that and parents who want their kids to go there. So with the new kind of ground rules that many school boards are establishing, where there is no rigid attendance areas any more, students again can make that choice. If they want to travel to that school and their parents want them to travel to it, they are free to do it, knowing that they can't walk to it but that they have to go by some kind of transport. I think this is good. I think there has to be the diversity to establish programmes like SEED, MAGU and AISP, and I guess one of the criteria for having—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is MAGU?

Hon. Mr. Wells: MAGU in North York is the Multi-Age Grouping Unit.

Mr. Stokes: It is the generation gap.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's a new experimental elementary school in North York. I think one of the criteria for these programmes is that the initials make a good word.

Mr. Foulds: MAGU is rather unfortunate.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is what I thought when I first heard it. Anyway, that is what it is called, the MAGU school.

Certainly there has to be room for these innovations and experimental programmes and these different types of schooling. Here again, though, I think we have to be very careful that we don't get carried away with thinking that these are the ultimate and that the whole system should change. Because every once in a while I read in the paper where someone is saying that this is the pattern for the future, that every school will be as this one is. We forget, I think, that every student is different.

We are stressing a continuum of education, and we are stressing more emphasis on the student as an individual and his individual development. That is why I would agree with your point that saying, for instance, every person should complete a credit course in 110 hours, is not living up to that expectation of education or to our philosophic feeling that every student learns at a different rate, a different speed and in a different length of time. For instance, although an average course under HS1 would normally be completed after 110 to 120 hours, I find the teachers who are really entering into the spirit of this programme, instead of trying to accept that as a rigid barrier, or a rigid time limit in which the course should be completed, are doing exactly what you suggested.

They are counting, and allowing to be counted as part of that time, work done by students, for instance, each day in a study period. Or the indivdual study that has been worked out between the teacher and the student—so many hours each week of individual study; and that can be counted toward the course.

Now, again, we have to be very careful that we don't say that this is the right thing for each student. Because there are other students who would perhaps not benefit from individual study. And they need the 110 hours of instruction or interrelation with the teacher.

Schools do have the freedom to do this, under this system. And those that are really doing it properly, I think, over the next few years, are going to develop some very interesting and beneficial ways of handling this programme.

Mr. Foulds: One of the difficulties, I think, is that often teachers are fairly adventurous on this point in terms of the time allotment and how they count the time. But, in many boards, you run into very timid administrators who feel, even yet—and this seems to me most unfortunate—that the regional department officials are going to clamp down on them if they don't have that 110 hours in there.

I don't how you do this, because once you put out a memo in writing that says, "You don't really absolutely need that 110 hours", you run into problems too. But is there any way that you can conscientiously reassure the timid administrators that sometimes a teacher might encounter in the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They'll all read this debate.

Mr. Foulds: You had better not believe that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would hope, and, in fact, I believe, that this is the work of our regional offices and our programme consultants

—that their job is to be out in the schools interpreting this to them. Please don't misunderstand me. I think that you still arrive at that 110 hours.

In other words, we are not saying you don't need the 110 hours. What I am saying is that that 110 hours doesn't have to be, say, in a traditional period — 110 hours of so many periods where you go into a class, sit down, and the teacher is teaching and the students are learning in the ideal situation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We don't want too much of that stuff.

Hon. Mr. Wells: What I am saying is that perhaps the teacher in that particular course will work out, with the student, a programme whereby two or three periods a week the student is working on his own in the resource centre and so forth, doing assignments connected with the course, and that those periods will be counted in with the other periods to make up the 110 hours.

In other words, it doesn't have to all be periods in the way that the subject would normally be taught. In fact, in some of the schools that I've been in, I find that they have arranged whole courses where the students are on their own for a great deal of the time. And for some students in some programmes, whole credit courses are being taught this way. Certainly, I think that is a good idea.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Brant.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am just going to say one other thing at this particular juncture. And this is a good place for me to perhaps express my ideas about grade 13. Because, following through with my thoughts, my belief is that, under the systems that we have been developing, in our continuum of learning, our ungraded classes, and our credit system, what we're saying is that each student should move through the educational process at his own speed, based on his own abilities and aptitudes. That he goes through the elementary school, then he goes through 27 credits and then six credits for his honour graduation diploma.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another 16 courses for his BA. It is exactly the same. You know it is.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But what I am saying is that I think that we are still way behind in the grade system when we talk about doing away with grade 13, or having it. Because I am firmly convinced that there are students in our system who can complete the whole programme, 27 credits and six honour credits, probably in roughly four years of secondary school. There are others who are going to take five years, and there are others who will probably take six.

If we try to say that you can do it all in five years, as we have done; if we try to say that that can be then condensed into four years, we're still making a fatal mistake. We are still trying to squeeze everybody into the same mould.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: One of the mistakes is when you talk about five years. What is that artificial division in there?

Hon. Mr. Wells: What I am saying is that I think by attrition we're working towards a system whereby a student will move at his own rate to get these credits. Some of them will do it in four years and some will do it in four-and-one-half and some will eventually do it in five. We haven't got to that place yet, but that is just my personal thinking and I think that that makes a lot more sense than saying that everybody has got to complete his total programme in four years or five years or six years. He'll complete it when he has completed the work according to his own ability. I think that that is the way we have to approach this. The problem is that the universities, perhaps, aren't caught up in the system. They have arbitrary times when they begin. But actually we see this vanishing because—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are very anxious to get through.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —what's happening is that the universities are going on semester systems. How many times have you or I had students come to us who are ready to go to, say, the University of Waterloo in January or February, but if they do go, they cannot get their honour graduates diploma?

They have to leave school and enter university; they are ready, the university accepts them; but they are denied their honour graduation diploma. You know, they feel a little cheated, I guess, because they have completed the high school system.

I suppose the feeling is that once they complete the university and get the university degree, nobody is going to ask them if they got an honour graduation diploma. But I think that that is the sort of game, the kind of thing that is going to happen. The kids are going to finish at different times and I think that that is probably the way it

should be. But we are not at that particular stage of development yet.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to follow up on one specific point. It still bothers me that we are talking in somewhat quantitative terms. I think that the intensity of the learning experience counts for something. I was just going through one of my files here and I came across—and I use this as an example, because it seems to me the kind of thing we have to start incorporating into the system, if you like, so that the system becomes less systemized – this clipping from the Toronto Daily Star of December 2. The headline is "High School Students Tackle Vigours of Crash Course in Serious Theatre." It had to do with some experiment that four boards of education in the Metro area did in conjunction with the St. Lawrence Centre. It was as valuable for these students to be involved in this course—which was a 10-week experience—as would be the experience in, say, a normal theatre arts class for the entire term.

What I would like to see us doing is trying to evaluate intensive courses like that, to incorporate them into the credit system. I would like to see them doing it, not only in that area, but in other areas, like some of the direct studies we have done in nature. The bill that the minister brought in and which is now in committee allows boards to use facilities outside of their school buildings for these studies. The intensity of those experiences, I think, should count for something.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The other day I tried to get into the discussion dealing with the circulars 14 and 15, and I guess this is a guideline sent out to teachers on the curriculum; suggested books to be used in the schools. I imagine this is what it is about, and I suppose one could shorten it up by saying that the guidelines will be perhaps to preserve our cultural naturalism.

I was just wondering about an article in the Globe and Mail on May 25, I believe it is. I have a letter from one of my constituents; I'll read it, a couple of paragraphs. It's a lengthy letter. I have about two others here besides this one, almost on the same principle.

On page 4 of this morning's Globe and Mail, there was a news item, "Politics course may include FLQ, Panthers" and so forth, in which it is said: "The Department of Education issued guidelines for such courses to Ontario high school students. Have our esteemed educators lost complete control of their senses? Or should we rename the taxpayer, finance arm of government, the Department of Corruption of Youth?

As a parent of four children, I am appalled at the way our school system has ever so subtly become an agent to corrupt our youth to its Marxist, Maoist, inordinate philosophies. I am a taxpayer. I'm sick of hearing those intellectual idiots tell us what is good, or is not good, for our children. I resent the Marxist sympathizers even suggesting such a course as above in the guise of education.

We have enough problems or troubles with these treasonous organizations such as the FLQ, and the Yankee Panther movement without bringing their insidious ideas into the forefront of a very impressionable young person's mind. I would suggest that the time and money would be much more wisely spent in introducing a course in good citizenship, love of our country's institutions, respect of law and order, and respect of authority.

We are presently facing the greatest breakdown of authority in respect to the sacred institutions of this country that made it the greatest country in the world to live in. I sincerely believe that our school system is responsible, along with the parents, to hide their heads in the sand and refuse to face up to what is being done to the children in the guise of education.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Signed by the United Empire Loyalists Association no doubt.

Mr. Haggerty: No, I'm afraid not, I won't give you the name.

Mr. Bounsall: Even John Stuart Mill would be suspect as being a subversive.

Mr. Lawlor: Are you on the side of the Family Compact? That's what I want to know.

Mr. Haggerty: Welcome back, Pat. It's good to have you back in the audience tonight.

Mr. Lawlor: You made a little speech along those lines last year.

Mr. Haggerty: I believe I was on to it last year.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes you were, the same speech, by George.

Mr. Haggerty: That's right. I expect to hear some of your comments tonight. This is quite right. I mentioned last year in the debate that I thought that there should be some screening of the textbooks in our classrooms.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, burn the books.

Mr. Haggerty: I believe that the books in the education system should provide the visions, beliefs of our culture with the beliefs, deeds to improve our way of life.

Mr. Lawlor: One of them is to have an intellectual understanding of a position other than your own.

Mr. Haggerty: And our culture should be guarded jealously. I can pick up here an article in Intercom, May, 1972, "Canada Day, 1972." Of course, I can feel rather proud of a comment here taken at the Port Colborne High School. The sponsor of this project is Mr. Jim Foley, who first thought of organizing Canada Day—he had no idea of what he was letting himself in for—"The whole thing began more than a year ago when Jim, who headed the English department at the high school, was looking for a way to attract students in his department to finer points in Canadian literature."

I might add, in the two years that this has been in operation in the Port Colborne High School it has been a great success. But one of the faults that I find is that there are no funds available through the Department of Education to continue with a programme of this nature in their schools.

I wonder if I could have the comments of the minister, on what guidelines he is going to establish, particularly on this letter which I just read to the minister — What guidelines have you established already to protect our Canadian culture in this particular instance?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm not sure what the hon. member means by "what guidelines am I going to suggest?" We have developed a curriculum guideline called "People in Politics." I think it is a good guideline. It is the beginning from which the local schools, teachers, curriculum people in local boards, people in the various collegiates, can develop their own course within this guideline. Or, if they wish to deviate, they can develop courses outside this guideline and submit them to us for approval. But I think that it is a pretty balanced course and it is the kind of course that would appeal to our young people today.

It is balanced in that it shows the young people the real things about the world that they live in and it tells them about democracy and about what is going on; and about what dissent is and totalitarianism and the role of political leadership. I really have no trouble in supporting this. In fact, I think it is a very interesting and forward-looking kind of course. This kind of course is one of many that we are introducing into the schools.

Mr. Stokes: I want to ask the minister something about the extent to which he thinks his department will get involved in the education of native students.

I realize full well that in the northern reserve settings, where there is no other alternative, that the native people have to rely on the educational wing of the Department of Indian Affairs and Natural Resources.

But you have gotten into education in the northern core schools, and I would like to say, since I have several of them in my riding—and I had a group from one of the northern core schools down yesterday — it just never ceases to amaze me the progress that is being made in some of those northern core schools. Also the dedication of the teachers that you are able to attract to them and the progress that is being made with limited facilities.

I'm wondering to what extent you are going to have curriculum changes that will assist native people to retain their native tongue and their cultural identity. It seems to me that in the last few years they have felt much more seriously about this; they feel much more strongly about it than they did even a few years back. Their leaders, anyway, are quite serious about maintaining their links with the past and maintaining their cultural and linguistic heritage.

I'm wondering if you are doing any research, or you are consulting with native groups in order to convince them that you are in fact willing to assist them? I have one here; it's an Indian education series, reading for adults, and it's put out by Confederation College of Applied Arts and Technology in the retraining division in Thunder Bay. With their limited resources, I would think they are making a pretty effective and significant contribution. However, this is just

one instance of where this is being done; and of course these are just initial steps taken to bring this about.

The reason I am concerned is because I feel that the Department of Indian Affairs isn't really equipped and really shouldn't be expected to bring the same quality of educational experience to many remote communities that your department should be able to do.

I realize there is a jurisdictional dispute here. In many instances, Indian groups and Indian leaders don't want any interference from the provincial government until their treaty and aboriginal rights are settled once and for all. But it does seem to me that there are many instances in many areas where you could assist.

As a matter of fact, I have a series of letters here from one of the larger Indian bands in the far north. I refer to the Big Trout Lake band. They enlisted my aid, and I believe the aid of the Minister of Natural Resources, who is from Kenora, and asked that your department continue to provide assistance to them and I think it was from the youth and recreation branch of your department.

I have correspondence here that says they had to cut it out because of budgetary constraints. The only reason it got started in the first place was because somebody on his own initiative started this project. And the people in Big Trout Lake thought it was just great. It was a summer programme, a counselling programme, and they thought very highly of it and wanted it continued.

It has since been discontinued and I am wondering, to what extent your department is first of all getting involved with regard to curricula to ensure the native parents that their children will retain to the greatest extent possible their cultural heritage; and to what extent will you be able to assist them in work that was formerly done by the department of youth and recreation and now done by some other branch of the government? I don't know who it is. Have you given any thought as to how we are going to approach the problem of educating our native people in a way that will be suitable to them and yet give them equal opportunity for those who wish to take advantage of this education and get involved into the mainstream of Canadian life, both economically and culturally?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I thank the member for his comments about this because certainly this is a very important area. We regard it as such in that we have Mr. Al Bigwin, who is an education officer in our curriculum development branch, working full-time on this particular matter.

Mr. Bigwin is a former public school principal from the great area of Scarborough and he brings to this job a very excellent background. He, of course, is following in the footsteps of Prof. Walter Currie, who for two years was in the department working in this particular area.

Mr. Bigwin is meeting with many of our native people to try to work out the very things that you have mentioned. He is trying to develop this for us because we believe what you have said. We believe that we must do those things in our system and with these people, to help them preserve their cultural heritage while still making available to them the advanced educational programme that all the students of this province are entitled to, and this we are working toward.

As you know, up in Manitoulin Island the course in the Ojibway language has been introduced into the secondary school; just one small facet of this whole programme, but an indication of a desire in that area to cultivate and to perpetuate this cultural background with those people.

One of the research grants in aid that we announced the other day is for a study in this area, "Academic Success for Northern Indian Students," by R. J. Preston at McMaster University. This is one of the projects that we funded in the list that I announced a couple of weeks ago here in the House.

There are meetings going on continually—as a matter of fact, I guess the last meeting was just last Friday—between our department staff and the Department of Indian Affairs to work on this particular problem. There is really no jurisdictional dispute, because I think that we both are after the same ends and we are really not fighting one another. We are merely trying to work out the best procedures, those procedures and those arrangements that are agreeable to the Indian peoples and the native people themselves.

We are trying to work them out so that this job can be done. We have told the department of Indian Affairs that any of the facilities that we have available to the students of this province are available to these people and we will make them available, particularly in the scattered areas of the north. Our correspondence courses, if these can be of help, are available. I have great hopes that Mr. Bigwin and the people who are

working with him will be making real progress in this particular area, and I know that they will.

Mr. Stokes: Just one little aside: I do get groups from northern Ontario, particularly the northern core schools—we've had them from Ferland, we've had them from Auden and I'm wondering, would it be possible for your department to undertake a student exchange, that is, where we get a group of students going away up to Lansdowne House, Fort Hope, or Big Trout Lake, while a group from there come down to southern Ontario? Not only would it give the native people a chance to see television for the first time, traffic problems for the first time, urbanization for the first time, it would also give our youth down here an appreciation of the way the other half lives away up north, where they live by their own skills and their own enterprise—a good many of them on the resources that they find in the area—where they do have to cope with isolation.

I think it would be a very worthwhile undertaking, at least on a trial basis. I know it does happen on certain occasions, but I would like to see this undertaken for a year on a regular basis, just to see what the exchange would do to the thinking of the two groups—those from the north put in an entirely new setting and environment and experience down here in the south, while their counterparts go from the south to the north to experience the other end of the spectrum.

Have the minister and his department given this any thought?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have money in this budget for student exchange, and in fact we intend to put some emphasis on this particular matter in the next year, both exchange of those students from the north to see and get a taste of conditions here, and vice versa, students from here exchanged to the northern areas, and I hope that this will be developed very shortly. There is money in here for this and we intend to proceed with it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I've got about three things I'd like to bring to the minister's attention, or ask his views upon in this issue, and the first one deals with Indian education.

I realize that he has a special staff attempting to work out some new approaches to Indian education. It has occurred to me that they might very well avail themselves of the expertise established on the Six Nations reserve, which has an independent education system which is inspected under the jurisdiction of the provincial department, but which has been very successful indeed and which more and more emphasizes aspects of Indian culture and heritage which I think the minister is interested in as well.

I would suggest that in this programme of exchanges the Six Nations reserve might very well be included, although I am aware of the fact that the Six Nations Indians are not accepted by all the northern bands as their full blood brothers by any means, they have somewhat different status. Yet it seems to me that they have accomplished things which should not be ignored, which have been recognized, certainly, in other areas of the education community. I simply suggest that to the minister so that it not be overlooked as a resource background.

They also have title to a very elaborate education facility which for many months has been completely unused. It's been turned over to the Six Nations by the government of Canada which, in their wisdom, decided they would not continue it as sort of a boarding school for Indians, many of whom came from the north. I think it was a good decision, because it was felt these young people should not be uprooted from their home and family to be sent away, sort of, to a boarding school which emphasized many of the values that are sort of inherent in southern Ontario, like television and traffic problems and urban sprawl, which are probably interesting but not essential to the understanding of the Indians in Attawapiskat or wherever you might suggest.

The second thing I want to ask the minister is, what is the present status of policy and curriculum in the teaching of religion in the public system?

Mr. Singer: That's a bit of a change.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, I'm sorry if you sent your advisor out. Maybe we will return to the Indian matters shortly; after ETV.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I will reply to your first question first. I think its superintendent, Joe Hill, is well known to our people and we certainly will make use of the resource that is there in the Six Nations system; and this will be done.

I think the answer to the second question regarding the status of religion in the elementary schools is that this matter is still being considered. But we have implemented one of the recommendations of the MacKay report, the introduction of a course on world

religions. The course outline is out. There is back-up and resource material being prepared. About 100 schools have indicated they are going to offer it this fall. We want to see just how this is carried out; what the reaction to it will be and the reception that it gets. The rest of the matter is still under consideration.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the regulation that requires the teaching of some approved course in religion been rescinded?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, it has not been rescinded, but it is still possible for boards to opt out of it if they wish; and many boards have.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't know what the minister is going to do about this, other than hope that it sort of doesn't bother him too much. I don't think it is going to bother him very much. But if he is relying on the attitude to leave it entirely up to local option, I hardly think that's good enough. I think there should be a statement of policy on this matter. I would certainly hope that the minister is not going to opt for any particularly stringent application of a course in religion, comparative religion, or even ethics as something that by virtue of government policy, if not forced, is at least urged on any school board.

I think the minister is aware of the background and even some of the traditions in this. Many people feel that the teaching of religion in schools has been a part of the tradition in the public system for many years. I'm sure that he is aware that while there has been religious teaching, particularly Bible readings and prayer, that in fact a regulation requiring religious instruction is relatively new, if you look at the whole spectrum of the history of this province. Actually, it was imposed about 1944.

I personally feel that it is practically impossible to develop a course that serves the public system. My own experience as a parent, as well as somebody with a continuing interest in education, is that it has given rise to a great deal of misunderstanding and sometimes hard feelings.

As a teacher I have seen many students, with their parent's permission, opt to leave the classroom when a local clergyman came in to teach; often with the very best of intentions. And also often with the most moderate and reasonable, let's say, broad and general approach to religion in its sort of small "r" form. He wasn't simply passing on what might have been his own particular views.

I have also certainly seen examples in the schools in my own municipality of local ministers who were not prepared to undertake this responsibility. The local board acceded to the request of a missionary organization, with its headquarters in Michigan, to send over a gentleman very zealous in his interest and commitment to this aspect of life. He came into the schools and taught the young people, including my own children. I wouldn't for a moment suggest that my kids didn't enjoy this and didn't like these people who came in, but I always found it absolutely incredible that these men were very committed missionaries who had come to save the heathens in a foreign land. There is simply no other way to look on it than that.

I don't think that's done anywhere in Ontario any more. I trust not, and if we need a regulation to prohibit it, I for one would support it, no matter how well motivated these people might be. As a member of the Legislature, I don't think I would support a government that would permit any other school board to make this service available to the young people. It is very difficult — in my view, impossible — to come up with anything other than a course in what is essentially history or perhaps literature which is going to meet what most people would understand as the teaching of religion in the schools.

I think this is something that the minister may have to come to grips with. One of his predecessors established a royal commission under the very best of auspices and the very best of chairmanship in the former Lieutenant Governor. It brought forward recommendations which even under those circumstances were, I guess, too touchy for the government to adopt, even in any of their less extreme positions, as government policy.

I think probably a statement in this connection would be in order from the minister. He and his predecessors for years have said this matter is under discussion and that they are prepared to look at certain courses that have evolved in individual municipalities. North York, for one, has spent a lot of time on it. Their teachers and some of their better people associated with their board developed courses which were not approved by some of the minister's predecessors. They were evidently waiting for an establishment of government policy.

It appears that government policy is never

going to be established. I suppose even a statement of that would be in order to provide some direction for people interested in this matter in the various school board jurisdictions. My own feeling is that there will never be a circumstance by which a teaching of religion in the schools, in the manner in which we have had it now for many years, will really be possible without being in some manner offensive to some group within the public school system. I don't know whether this minister is going to reach some decision in this regard or not, but perhaps he could give us some more definitive impression of his views.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, at this particular juncture in my ministry, having only been here about four months, I am not prepared to make any definitive statement on this.

I recognize the great concern that many people in this province have over this matter. I realize that it has been studied very fully. I suppose the only thing that has held up more action — although I must say that the development of the world religions course has certainly been a very positive step arising out of that report — is the fact that the ministers have changed in this department over the past couple of years.

We haven't had an opportunity in our own way to adequately come to grips with this, because this is a matter that I suppose becomes very very personal. It is a matter that becomes very emotional with a lot of people. It is a matter on which people have very strong opinions.

I have set a timetable to familiarize myself with the background of the problem and then to meet with various groups in this province who have different opinions about this particular matter. I have done this to a limited degree now, and I intend to do it over the next little while. Dr. Clive Beck of OISE is doing some very interesting studies for us in the development of moral education in the early years and in ethics. Perhaps out of this we will be able to obtain some help.

I think that one of the big hangups in switching or in doing something in this particular area has been to try to develop something in the field of morals and ethics. Over the years the traditions in this country certainly have been that religion has been the guardian of ethics and morals. This has been the vehicle by which they have been infused into our school system.

Indeed, I find when I attend trustee gatherings and teacher-professional development days in the separate school system I am reminded again and again that this is one of the very special things that this school system still does which the public school system doesn't do. Everyone, from the superintendent and the archbishop down, usually makes very forceful and effective speeches on this particular value of their educational system. I'd hate to think that we were developing a system that was completely lacking in any teaching of morals and ethics, whereas we have a complementary system that is doing this.

The other thing that has bothered me in this particular area is that some of the people who I talk to seem to think that in our school system we are going to be able to not only eliminate religion but to eliminate anything connected with religion. I think this kind of assumption is wrong. There is no question that over the many, many years—

Mr. Stokes: That's education too.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —of the history of the world, religion has been a powerful force in life. Some of the bloodiest wars in the world and some of the greatest acts of love have been caused by of religion.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: These wars are going on right now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, some may be. But you can't obliterate those, and you can't obliterate the fact that Christ lived, or that Mohammed lived, or that other people lived, and that certain things happened, and that there was a Spanish inquisition, and that there were the wars of the Crusades, and things like this.

I would hate to think, as some people seem to say to me, that not only are we going to take out some of the courses of religion but we are going to remove all these other kinds of things—anything that might have to do with religion—from our history courses, from our politics courses, from all these courses of course, that can't be done.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I never heard that suggested.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I realize the Leader of the Opposition hasn't suggested this, but some—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't recall it even being suggested.

Permit me, Mr. Chairman, I have heard it suggested that perhaps opening exercises

might be eliminated, and I would agree that they should not be. But I haven't heard this business about expunging from history any reference to things that are religious. I mean that's—

Hon. Mr. Wells: All I am illustrating is the kind of broad views there are on this particular topic—that there are some people who have said this to me. Granted they wouldn't take away everything—some form of religious teaching or religion in the schools would be represented by leaving some of these events in. We can't rewrite the history of the world in order to conform with what some people would like to have as their viewpoint. I don't think that this can be done.

But, as I say, at this particular point in time we are still studying this matter. The assurance I can give the Leader of the Opposition is that, as I indicated a while back, we hope to bring in next session a revised, consolidated Education Act that will remove the anachronisms; it will remove some things and will add others to be a modern piece of legislation governing education in this province. At least by that time I think we will have faced this particular problem and will have made some statement on it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, can the minister tell me, are some boards still requiring the teaching of a course that might be called religious education based on the curriculum that is now about 30 years old?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, a few in some places. I can't tell you where, but there are a few still.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Do you have—not inspectors, of course—but resource people that look into the manner in which these are taught. Are they taught by local clergy, or are there any courses remaining which are taught, let us say, by zealots from outside the community?

Hon. Mr. Wells: This would be left to the local board, and the board would decide how this would be done. They might be using local clergy, people from the community, coming in to teach, and if the community didn't approve of this, their course of action would be to talk to the local board about it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If you would permit me, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the minister would have someone give me the information as to which boards are still doing it that way. It doesn't have to be now; it could be a letter sometime in the future, and perhaps I could raise it with the minister on another occasion.

The last thing I want to raise, Mr. Chairman—I won't take too much time with it—does have to do with educational television. It won't be necessary, I don't think, for the minister's advisors to change places.

I have been concerned with some of the things that have been referred to both by my colleague from Downsview and by my colleague from Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) in another estimate that it tends to discount the effectiveness of the educational television that has been built up over a number of years.

I gather that, as viewed from other jurisdictions, we are doing very well indeed. While there is some argument about how much we are selling to other jurisdictions and what the costs are, I think, in fact, the programmes seem to be very good indeed.

I personally regret that we live just beyond the fringe area of channel 19 and I look forward to seeing some of these programmes. I read about them and I think that is excellent, that is great. I was interested to note that the advisor to the minister here tonight, who is probably the executive director to the independent educational television authority, is a former—

An hon. member: Chairman.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Chairman is he? Well, he is a former teacher of the NDP education critic, and I don't know whether this is a commentary of the chairman's continuing abilities or the ability of the member to override difficulty.

Mr. Foulds: Combination of both.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Anyway, I thought that was quite interesting.

Educational television, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Stokes: They are both proud of their association.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, that is good; that is healthy in both respects.

But it has been a matter of debate here for many years, and it is almost the way we used to talk about research in education. We have almost been overfulfilled, sort of like praying for rain and being swept away in a flood.

Mr. Foulds: That's the second time you have used that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, right.

The commitment of dollars to educational television has been tremendous and certainly no one on this side has said that it has been too little. If anything, we feel that the commitment made for educational television has hardly been justified by the use made of educational television throughout the province. More and more we have the feeling that maybe these excellent programmes are essentially going to have to be put on tape or on film and made use of that way in the various schools. When I talk to teachers—and even think about it myself—the chances of them tuning into channel 19 or its satellites for a specific programme at a specific time becomes very remote.

In some of the best equipped school systems, of course, they can send a note down to somebody, some highly paid technician, and see that a specific programme or series is taped, which is then put into their own classrooms at a convenient time. I don't suppose we could have anything much more convenient than that, or much more expensive. Educational television then simply becomes a very modern, very expensive way of distributing taped and filmed programmes to the various school systems.

I might as well say that this problem certainly has been referred to previously; that we are a long way from having any blanket coverage of the whole province; that I feel in many ways the programme has been more expensive than is justified by the results, even though the individual programmes are excellent. I don't know myself but these are the reports that I have read from expert opinion.

I often think perhaps we are missing some of the opportunities that the ETV programme and commitment offers. I have mentioned it many times before and I refer particularly to the teaching of language. One of the aspects of the cafeteria approach to education that the minister is talking more and more about—in other words you go to school and take what you choose with practically no limits at all—is that a lot of good students are finding that math is a little tough for them and that French is not as interesting as "Man and His World"—is that right?

Mr. Foulds: "Man and Society."

Mr. R. F. Nixon: "Man and Society." I have a tendency to suspect that even though the minister's percentages might give rise to optimism, a good many of our young people are missing out on an opportunity to become proficient in, let us say, French conversational usage. I have often felt that while the programme to provide good education for French teachers, particularly at the elementary level, has gone forward quite well most schools of the elementary type do not have nearly adequate instruction in language.

Compared with almost any jurisdiction in the world, outside of North America, we still have the strangest attitude to language instruction. Almost none of our graduates from grade 13, if you will pardon the expression, know very much about the French language. They may have been able to do the formal work. They may have read a certain number of pieces of literature in French but they don't have an understanding of the French language, its literature and its culture.

I think if there is one area of severe criticism of the educational policy this is it. It's criminal that the young people—and the minister now taking his seat is probably as responsible as any—that we have—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You're not bilingual are you?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Yes!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, yes?

Mr. Stokes: I'll bet he watches "Chez Hélène" every morning.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Voulez-vous couchez avec moi?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You are very good in Italian.

Mr. Foulds: The answer is a resounding "no!"

Mr. Stokes: Will you translate that for us?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We are doing a little work on the ethics, too, and maybe we can combine them.

An hon. member: Will you knock that out of Hansard?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If there was one way where the minister—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Come to order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —where the minister might make an historic impact on the province—isn't it great to have him back? All we need is the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and we would have a great debate.

Mr. Stokes: You threw him off completely! You really threw him!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Anyway, to get back to this historic impact, I would suggest that if the minister could withstand the political flak that he might get from Scarborough and maybe even some other centres, he could embark on a programme of language education which is sorely needed in this province and he could use educational television as the basic tool.

I don't see why our young people, from kindergarten or pre-kindergarten on, couldn't have an opportunity to hear well-spoken and interesting French discussion for 20 minutes every day. Even if the Minister of Colleges and Universities would find it beyond him there are others who, at an earlier age before their opinions are as set as his, might benefit from it tremendously.

We are not talking about any kind of prejudice although, in fact, that could be brought into this matter. As this is a bilingual nation I think it is simply atrocious that this province has not done more in the field of French education. The Minister of Education, the Minister of Colleges and Universities, and I are three products of an education system which has pious goals in the teaching of language, but we are walking examples of how ineffectually those goals have been achieved when the Minister of Colleges and Universities has only learned one pidgin-French phrase which I am sure has served him well in the past.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: It's nice to get down to the basics!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would say that while there could be a great deal of emphasis on this in the formal curriculum and in the formal courses for which our students might opt, let's say, at the beginning of the secondary level, we ought to have a policy which gives all of our young people an opportunity to at least get some sort of an appreciation of a second language, and many of our kids growing up are going to have three and four languages.

I know the ministers opposite, from time to time, visit Europe and other jurisdictions in their search for better methods of administering this province. I would be very surprised indeed if, when they conferred with top administrative officials in almost any other jurisdiction out of North America, I would be surprised if their opposite numbers could not talk with them in English. And some of these ministers might even consider a mark in their favour that they only had one language, and that they hadn't messed around in the past with a bow to any other language. I'm sure that's not true of the Minister of Education, although it might be true of some of his colleagues.

Mr. Stokes: The Minister of Revenue can't even play ping pong in Chinese.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So I want to offer this to the Minister of Education who might be in this portfolio a bit longer than he was in his previous one, till maybe sometime in 1975. I am not saying the same thing for the Minister of Revenue whose days are numbered. But if he could withstand the political flak from his colleagues particularly, as well as that from some of the municipalities of this province, one thing he could do in Ontario would be to set up a programme of language instruction which would mean something.

Only the dodos who simply could not avail themselves of the opportunity would be drop-outs from language instruction. We would turn out students from the end of the secondary system who had some appreciation of the culture, and the language, and the conversational use of French—and other languages possibly—but French on a priority basis. It can be done with the use of educational television, because, you know, while you can turn out platoons of language teachers, only one in a 100 is going to have the skill to go before a class of disinterested people who are used to picking basket weaving and roller skating as their options—and this is no exaggeration, my daughter in a school under your jurisdiction roller skates a couple of afternoons a week. That's just fine, she loves to do it.

But I would say that you need teachers with a special skill to hold the interest of young people, and you're never going to get enough people to do this in all the schools. But you can do it through educational television. You can get one transcendental teacher, whose ability can be put on film or tape, or whatever—whatever the chairman of the independent authority is using these days—which can then be used in every school in the province. And if you don't have teachers that can cope with this sort of thing, they can learn along with the kids.

I would suggest to the minister that if anybody pays any attention to my remarks, and I get mail back which is 10 to one

opposed to what I say, that I can stand it. But I would suggest that if he wants to make any kind of a mark for achievement in the years of his ministry or his work in politics, this is the one way to do it. He's not going to do it by making any pronouncements on the teaching of religion in the schools, and he's not going to do it emphasizing the great cafeteria system which we will talk about some other time, maybe at greater length, which is very interesting too. But he can do it this way and the tool is within his jurisdiction. It's educational television. We are used to voting mountains of money for them, and this is one project that they ought to take on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has hurt my feelings. I'm going to leave.

Mr. B. Newman: Don't do that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition are very appropriate.

Mr. Ruston: Always appropriate.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I certainly agree completely with the sentiments in regard to developing an even better system of teaching French to English-speaking students in this province, but I am not so sure that educational television can and will play a part and a greater part. I'm not so sure that it can play perhaps the transcending part that he has indicated.

An hon. member: You don't know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The only problem with that is that you can't talk back to that image on the screen. I'm not so sure that—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Surely for 20 minutes a day the students could stand a situation where they don't get a chance to talk back?

Hon. Mr. Wells: If I get home, and as most members of this Legislature know, as Minister of Education I don't usually get home before 11 o'clock in the evening, but if I do happen to get home for supper and then go upstairs, I usually hear a record of Monsieur Thibault going.

Mr. Stokes: Voix et images.

Hon. Mr. Wells: My boy is playing it over and over upstairs.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: And he has his pea soup.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The only trouble is that he's got nobody to talk back to him or to correct him, while he is trying to copy the words on that record. While I think that record plays a helpful role in developing conversational French, there are probably a lot of other things that have to go into it, too. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition has seen the programmes that the CBC has had on. My kids have watched them and I have watched them. I regret to say it has done me no good; but I've watched them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You and I are too old for that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We're too old. But I must say they had a very vivacious, attractive teacher teaching it on the programmes that I remember on television. They had all the props there and everything, but it didn't do me any good.

Let me just say, though, that I do think that we have to develop, and that we will. We will develop a more effective system of teaching French. I am really surprised and amazed at my 3½-year old daughter, who can count to 10 in French because she's in nursery school with a French-Canadian lad who happens to be living down in our area, and who, I guess, talks to her at nursery school in French. I certainly haven't taught her to count to 10 in French, and neither has my wife, and I am sure no one else has. It's amazing that a 3½-year-old can master that, and I think that that is perhaps an example for us to note.

I think it was Dr. Wilder Penfield who said that you should get started with the second language as early as possible. I don't know. There are probably many educationists who disagree with this, but perhaps we haven't started as early as possible. I think that there will be developments in the very near future in the whole area of bilingual schools. Since the Symons report was issued, I've had as much reaction from Anglophones who want to get into French schools. They feel that perhaps the emphasis in the Symons Report was that the French-language school system was only for the Francophones of this province and that Anglophones would be deprived of entrance to French schools.

They feel that this is not right and that they want to be able to get their children to get this kind of an atmosphere, because they think it's a much better atmosphere in

which to learn true bilingualism. I think there will be a lot of development in this particular area. Boards are getting interested in it.

I intend to establish very shortly that task force that the Symons report suggested on bilingual education and to ask it to look into this particular matter, not over a long period of time, but in a very short period of time and bring us back some recommendations, some areas in legislation and regulations that we should change to make this more easily possible for boards.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman, I was going to speak on the French language and on the Symons report on French-language secondary education which was a very welcome one. It is a very detailed report. It calls for French-language committees to be set up and proposes recommendations as to their composition, how they would be elected and responsibilities of the committees. I wonder how much of this has been done already.

It also recommends the creation of a linguistic rights commission and standing committees at the various levels of education in the province, both in the Department of Education at the head office and in the regional offices and thereafter the local level with the boards of education, and even down to agencies. It talks about the various curriculum matters as it affects textbooks and educational television itself, and so on. I am very glad to hear that the minister, in the very final recommendation of the report—where it talks about establishing a task force to determine the needs of the English-speaking community in terms of receiving French education—that he's going to take this very seriously and appoint that very quickly.

In my family, I have sent my daughter, who is now 7½, to a completely French-language school since the time she was five. I might say that since January of this year, when she just turned seven, she has become really bilingual. Her vocabulary isn't large in either language, it's normal for a seven-year-old, but she certainly is bilingual. I would hope that this sort of opportunity would be available to all of the English-speaking school children in our province.

Something I do want to mention—and it also is in the Symons report that you have mentioned—are the considerations regarding finances. It indicates that there should be a standing committee to determine the additional costs of getting a French-language education for French-speaking students—it would also apply to English-speaking students wanting their entire education in the French language—and, having determined the additional cost, to go ahead and provide that additional opportunity in the schools.

I'd like to endorse that point of view. I hope that there is some action on this. Maybe I should ask that question. Has there been some action taken to determine through a standing committee, or what have you, the additional costs in providing French-language education to a community?

However, there is one other aspect of this: In the city of Windsor the only way that you can get a French-language education at the elementary level as well as at the secondary level, just happens to be in the separate school system. And when one is looking at this whole field of the extra cost for French-language education made available to French or English students, I hope the minister would forget about differences in the two school systems in determining whether or not grants should be given; that you would give them to both. Something perhaps should be done by his department.

I should ask the minister if he is encouraging public school boards in the province, really encouraging them, to consider providing French-language education. The Windsor public school board has categorically refused to even make a survey at the elementary level, let alone the secondary level, to see if there is a desire for French-language education in the public system. So if I want a French-language education for my daughter, and I'm a supporter of the public system, the only way I can get it is to send her to a separate school and perhaps pay the appropriate penalty for so doing. So I would hope that in this particular area of French-language education that the minister would extend whatever financing is necessary, irrespective of the school system.

Mr. Chairman: We'll have to close at this point in order to rise and report by 10:30.

Mr. Bounsall: Right! I'll continue my remarks tomorrow, if I may.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee of supply rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we'll proceed with the continuation of the consideration of the estimates of the Ministry of Education.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 1, 1972

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, continued 3091

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 3119

No. 79

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, June 2, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1972

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are favoured with guests this morning. In the west gallery, students from Huron Heights Secondary School of Newmarket, and in both galleries there are boys and girls from the Main St. School of the Beaches-Woodbine riding. These children are from more than a dozen countries around the world and they are at this school to learn the English language before being placed in the regular school system.

A little later in the morning we will be joined by students from the Prince Charles School of Brantford, from the Winona Drive Public School of Toronto, the Broadview Public School of Ottawa and the Warnica Public School of Painswick.

Statements by the ministry.

REAL ESTATE INDUSTRY REGULATIONS

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House today new regulations which will change the requirements for entry into Ontario's real estate industry.

As members of the House will be aware, the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations has the responsibility to ensure fair and competent practice within the real estate industry. To that end the ministry presently employs a registrar of real estate and business brokers, whose job it is to examine and register brokers and salesmen and to maintain an office to receive, investigate and act upon public complaints concerning real estate practice.

There is recognition of the fact that the existing educational entry standards for both salesmen and brokers are seriously inadequate. Further, there exists a strong desire within the ministry and the real estate industry to upgrade the entry requirements in order to achieve a high degree of competence within the industry and of protection to the public.

It has long been recognized by this government that the test of professional competence is one of the most fruitful and least cumbersome tools available for ensuring a fair marketplace for the people of Ontario. With this in mind, a joint committee of representatives from the Real Estate Association and my ministry was formed to "study and recommend education entry prerequisites" which would better serve the public and the industry.

The result of this committee's deliberations was a series of unanimous recommendations which have been framed into new regulations specifying educational requirements for entry into the various levels within the real estate industry.

Phase one of the new programme will be an introductory course on real estate which will be mandatory for anyone seeking to become a registered real estate salesman. This course will be considerably expanded over the optional course which has been offered by the Real Estate Association and will include a code of ethics for salesmen and brokers. This phase one part of the education programme will become effective July 1 of this year.

Phase two of the new requirements will be a certificate programme which will consist of four courses, including real property law, an introduction to appraisal, an introduction to property management and one of industrial, commercial or rural real estate. This programme, along with specific requirements of practical experience as a salesman, will be mandatory for those seeking to become either branch real estate office managers or brokers and must be passed before application is made for registration. It is estimated that the average salesman would be able to complete this course over a two-year period.

Finally, phase three of the new regulations will consist of a course entitled "Real Estate Administration," which will be required of those who want to make application for registration as a real estate broker. Phase three will become effective July 1, 1972.

In all of these courses, the passing mark of 75 per cent or better will be required before

the candidate can go on to register. Examinations will be set by a standing committee advisory to my ministry and will be marked by the Ontario Real Estate Association, subject, of course, to review by the registrar at his discretion. All courses will be taught by competent lecturers at community colleges.

The administration of the new education programme will be the responsibility of the Ontario Real Estate Association, but the final authority on course content and administrative procedures will rest with the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mr. Speaker, these are the broad outlines of the comprehensive regulations which have been introduced to maintain a close correspondence between the demands of the real estate market and the ability of the real estate industry to meet them. The courses of study will be inexpensive, widely available and open to all. We believe, therefore, that they will help to ensure that the real estate industry is socially responsible and offers an opportunity for every able citizen in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

EGG INDUSTRY

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture can now give us that statement he promised one of his colleagues a few days ago about the marketing situation in eggs, particularly with the influx of eggs from other jurisdictions?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a word about the egg marketing situation today. I would first of all say that the Provinces of Manitoba and Quebec are here in Toronto this morning; that is, the representatives of the egg producers and the marketing boards of the respective governments are here in Toronto today trying to hammer out an agreement among the three provinces to stabilize the price of eggs on a joint basis. I understand that the Province of British Columbia will be involved in these negotiations at the conclusion of the meeting this morning.

I have been in touch with the federal Minister of Agriculture. I spent all day Monday with him in Ottawa, with the appropriate officials of our department and his working on this programme. We have been in touch with the Ministers of Agriculture in both Manitoba and Quebec and we are hopeful that there will be a substantial increase to producers in the price they receive for eggs, as a result of the surplus removal programme which we hope will result from today's meeting.

The federal government have expressed an interest in introducing some type of increased fowl slaughter programme, but I share their concern that they want to make it effective with the introduction of supply management in all the provinces. There is little point in slaughtering increased numbers of egg-producing hens in this province or throughout Canada if those same hens are going to be replaced by pullets as soon as they get the programme completed. We don't accomplish anything.

We have undertaken, as I am sure the members of the House know through the statement I made some weeks ago, to implement the Ross inquiry report including quota production. It would look as though Province of Ontario egg producers will be required to reduce production by about 10 per cent over previous years. That is, the top production of previous years.

This really isn't a very significant drop in production, bearing in mind that there will be a corresponding increase in the price that producers receive for those eggs. Some other provinces will have a smaller decrease in production. Some, in fact, may have their quota allocation increased a bit over what they have been producing in the past.

Ontario's share of the national egg market will be 38.6 per cent, which is a pretty substantial amount of eggs to be produced by our province in relation to the rest of the country. We feel that progress is definitely being made and we are working with the present Egg and Fowl Producers' Marketing Board to develop the plan to allocate the quotas.

I think it is important that our egg producers in Ontario recognize there will be a reduction of approximately 10 per cent. Frankly, I hope it is less than that but it is going to be in the neighbourhood of a 10 per cent reduction from other years. They should be warned of that now, to get ready for what will be the target date of probably August or Sept. 1, hopefully, for the implementation of that allocation of quotas.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary. Can the minister tell the House if he is taking any short term measures to assist the egg pro-

ducers right now? Evidently it will be some days or even weeks before the quotas are established and accepted and the supply is reduced by 10 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't make that clear I should have. It is hoped that as a result of today's meeting the eggs now surplus in Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia will be removed from the market.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How would he do that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is to be a deduction made on all eggs produced in these provinces on a per case basis. This requires an extension of powers under the Agricultural Products Marketing Act of Canada to take a small deduction off of each 30-dozen case of eggs, which will go into the stabilization fund to remove that very small surplus. We can market about 92,000 30-dozen cases a week in the Province of Ontario without adversely affecting the market, but right now we're marketing about 95,000 to 97,000 cases a week. That will mean that about 3,000 to 5,000 cases will be taken off the market and will either be put in storage or sent directly to the breakers, but they will not be put on the market.

This is what's been happening in the past. Manitoba, British Columbia and Ontario have been shipping these normal surplus eggs into the Montreal market and it's depressed the price there to the place where it's backed right up across the country and there are some dealers and some grading stations which can't move their eggs at all. Obviously, something had to be done and we feel that, effective immediately, this programme will come about. It's a surplus removal programme, where the eggs will be sent immediately to the breakers, or put in storage—one thing or the other.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you'll permit one more supplementary, from me anyway, does the minister then project that the price will go up immediately, by say, 10 to 12 cents a dozen, or how much?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I don't think the price will go up that much. I hope it will but I doubt if it will. It's difficult to know just how much it will go up. My guess is that it will probably be six or seven cents immediately to the producer and, probably when the programme gets fully into effect, it could be 10 cents a dozen. I hope it will be. Somewhere around the 30 cent level is what we expect.

CREDIT CARD ENTRY TO ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Can he explain the relationship between Ontario Place and the Shell Oil Co., that has led it to a fairly substantial advertising campaign for Ontario Place and has led the government to permit Shell credit card owners to use their credit cards to get into Ontario Place? Is this a function of the increased cost that it has to be associated with a credit card, or is the minister predicating it on free advertising?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, the arrangement is one of a number of co-op advertising schemes which we have with a number of firms in the private sector. As the hon. member will know, Ontario Place has been used as a backdrop for automobile advertisements and for some number of other products. In this way, without cost to the public purse, we make this public facility better known to our citizens and to visitors to the province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary. Wouldn't the minister feel that some citizens —certainly I would be one of them—would feel that this would be an unnecessary delay in getting through the turnstiles if the person in front of you is fooling around with his Shell credit card? The person in there, instead of looking for the free pass the minister probably flashes, has to drag out that machinery and take the numbers down. I think it's a ridiculous approach. Can the minister justify it more effectively than he already has?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Does the minister allow Diners' Club or American Express?

Hon. Mr. White: Having been out there half a dozen times, I have observed no lineups and no delays at the entrance; so I think this is not a legitimate objection to the programme.

Mr. Lewis: A supplemenary, Mr. Speaker: Conceding that there appear to be no lineups at Ontario Place—indeed, there appear to be no people at Ontario Place—how widespread is the minister's advertising to bolster sagging attendance at the showplace of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. White: Our advertising is very greatly cut back this year for Ontario Place. I think the amount of money available is $100,000 or $120,000. Most of this money

will be used to advertise special events, like the Toronto Symphony. These major events are scheduled into the better months of the year. I myself am not concerned about attendance.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): There is much better attendance this month this year than this month last year.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why did the government increase the rates?

Hon. Mr. White: The principal objective, so far as I personally am concerned, is to put revenues and expenses into some kind of appropriate balance.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Are they?

Hon. Mr. White: We are making progress on this year by year and the forecasts have been provided in detail to the House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I hope the minister's projections are better than those of his predecessors.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): What projections were they?

Hon. Mr. White: The number of people who enjoy that facility will, no doubt improve as the weather warms up.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, you had the traffic stopped for miles. You had lineups to the peninsula waiting to get in.

Hon. Mr. White: The facility was open this year on May 20, compared to June 12 last year; so to compare the first few opening days, May 20 versus the middle of June last year, I think is not indicative. I said I thought we would have something like 2 million or 2.1 million visitors this year in contrast to the total of 2.3 million last year. I personally deplore the emphasis on the numbers of people who go through the wickets.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's understandable!

Hon. Mr. White: I think it's gross oversimplification of the quality of this particular public service.

Mr. Lewis: If the numbers were high he would be accepting them.

Hon. Mr. White: It's a cop-out, so far as I'm concerned, when it comes to certain of the critics whether they be in the opposition or in the press.

Mr. Lewis: What do you want us to do, fly over it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nobody likes it but the people.

Hon. Mr. White: It's just a cheap substitute for coming to a proper appreciation of the assets and liabilities of that particular site.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Popularity is usually measured by the number of people going through the turnstiles.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Lock the gates and keep it perfect.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have questions?

DWELLING INSURANCE INCREASE

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, albeit for some ministers who aren't here. But I will ask one of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Has his Superintendent of Insurance seen, approved, or been in touch with the insurance industry about its intention to increase premiums for dwelling insurance and to decrease coverage?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that, of course, because I can't directly communicate with the superintendent. But I must inform the hon. member that we communicate in regard to increases in rates, but we have no discretion or authority to dictate increases or decreases.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the minister know whether he has had a set of rate increases submitted to his department?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: A question of the minister of Housing—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Housing today!

PETS IN OHC PROJECTS

Mr. Lewis: Housing today!

Without beating it to death, can he tell me, just out of curiosity, why it is that a housing authority will not allow people who

rent the right to have such odd things as pets, as apparently is the case in Guelph?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, knowing the NDP's interpretation of what is urgent public importance, I made it my business to get a copy—

Mr. Lewis: Well, if there were other ministers here, I would ask them questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I made it my business to get a copy of the new lease as quickly as I could. We had gone into this last year, and the way the lease read did concern me.

It isn't true that pets are not permitted. In fact, the appropriate section of the lease reads:

> Animals and other pets may be permitted with the approval of the housing manager. Permission normally will be given if the pet is appropriate to the type of building and will last so long as the tenant exercises proper control over the pet, observes all applicable municipal bylaws and regulations and so long as the pet does not interfere with the rights and enjoyment of other tenants and neighbours.

Now there has been some particular problem in Guelph along these lines over the past year. I don't know precisely at this moment what happened in this instance, but I have asked OHC to get a report from Guelph. There seems to be some particular reason why this is not accepted out there. I am sure it will be resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. MacDonald: It's a good thing the minister recognized the importance of the question.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

PRO-CON CONSOLIDATED WAREHOUSING

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question by the member for Windsor West (Mr. Bounsall) in regard to Pro-Con Consolidated Warehousing.

The department has record of an Ontario corporation called Cartwright Cartage Ltd., incorporated Jan. 6, 1969; it has three directors and a minimum of capitalization. It is listed as carrying on business under the name of Pro-Con Consolidated Warehousing, 35 Oak St., Weston. Both corporations are listed and both corporations' addresses and phone numbers are available to the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Government Services has the answer to a previous question.

WEEKEND PARKING FOR PUBLIC AT DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR LOTS

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the hon. member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) had a question regarding parking space at the foot of York St. I am pleased to advise the hon. member that the parking space located at the former Department of Labour building will be made available to the public starting this weekend, through an arrangement that my ministry has entered into with the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, who will have their personnel on the adjoining lot to operate this for us.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

PURCHASE OF U.S. GOODS

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): I have a question of the Minister of Government Services. Can the minister tell me why in the Whitby Psychiatric Hospital a number of items worth well over $500 have been purchased directly in the United States without first inviting tenders from Canadian companies, as is the rule?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this. I will certainly check into it. I wouldn't know whether these articles were purchased by my ministry or by the Ministry of Health, but I will get the answer for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

PROFESSIONAL FUND-RAISING

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Is the minister aware that some professional fund-raising organizations return to the charitable groups for whom they raised funds as little as 15 per cent of the total funds raised? For example, the North American Indian Development Organization received only $1,650 in a campaign which grossed more than $12,000. Does the minister plan some method of bonding, licensing or regulating professional fund-raising organizations?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am not aware of the situation to which the hon. member refers. If he would like to let me have specific details, I would have a very careful look at it. I haven't a plan at the moment to control this type of organization, but if it is that serious—and again, as he knows, my interest is in seeing that the public of Ontario does have a measure of protection against this sort of fleecing, if I may use the term—

Mr. MacDonald: Almost as bad as the Irish sweepstake.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Almost, yes. That's in your mind, sir.

But I would be prepared to consider bringing that into the realm of control. I might tell him—I know of his interest in this field—we are looking at a broad type of legislation to cover all of this sort of function and operation, which I hope we will be dealing with perhaps before the end of this year. If he will let me have the details I will certainly do what I can.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have just sent over to the minister a copy of the press clipping, which shows the unusually low amount received by some of the organizations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary: Aren't there some kind of regulations now that relate generally to this area, for example, in reference to bingo—as a result of experiences two or three years ago?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think the hon. member is talking about the legislation that exists regarding lotteries; that would cover the point raised by him. But my reference was not to that sort of legislation, mine was—and that is why I hesitate to be specific—to something in the nature of a Fair Practices Act, which would cover the whole field in this regard. But I think that other situation is under the control of the lotteries division.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

LAKE ONTARIO CEMENT LTD.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General regarding the request of the Environmental Law Association for his permission to prosecute the Lake Ontario Cement Ltd. for violating the Beach Protection Act. Is the minister giving this request favourable consideration?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): I received that letter from them just two days ago. There was a notice that they intended to file a claim or to take action in reference to that matter, but no actual action has been taken on their part as yet; they simply filed the notice with us as required.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Does the Attorney General recall the post-election promise of the Premier (Mr. Davis) to try to find alternative sources of sand for this company?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I recall the discussion with reference to that matter which, of course, relates to another department. They don't need consent from me in reference to taking action; they are simply giving me notice that they intend to do so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

ALLEGED DELAY IN PREPARING BILLS

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Can the Attorney General supply more help to Mr. Tucker in his department, who is so far behind in his work that he can give no estimate of when bills will be ready? The Attorney General is asking the Minister of Justice! Can the Attorney General explain to me why Mr. Tucker had to say that he can do two things at once but he can't do three things at once?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I think, Mr. Speaker, that government business must take priority. If the hon. member has been inconvenienced in any way, he must understand that there are a great many important bills coming through from the government side.

Mr. Shulman: Can the Attorney General explain why Mr. Tucker can give no estimate of when things will be ready, no estimate of time whatsoever? He can't even suggest that it will be ready by the end of the session.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Tucker has to take into account the overall problems and Mr. Alcombrack, I am sure, would supervise the work generally in that area.

Mr. Shulman: Will the minister answer my question—will he supply additional help there so that these things can get done?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I have been speaking to Mr. Alcombrack this week about the matter generally as to the volume of the work and what needs to be done to speed it up so the work of the session is in hand.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member thinks he is being discriminated against.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

SPADINA RAPID TRANSIT

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): A question of the Premier: Does he realize that tomorrow is the first anniversary of his momentous decision to scuttle the Spadina Expressway and as yet there are no visible new facilities for public transit in my particular area of Metropolitan Toronto? Can the Premier enlighten us as to when he expects his avowed policy of moving people instead of cars will be fructified with success?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Yes, I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow, I believe it is, marks the anniversary of that very historic decision which received a great deal of support in this House. Except from the official opposition where the support was somewhat fragmented; the decision was greeted with enthusiasm by some, with alarm by others. Of course, it was one of—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A little more than alarm.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Several million dollars worth and that's a helluva lot.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the determining characteristics in the assessment made by the general public last fall. I fully appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. I quite understand that there is no visible evidence of alternatives as yet—

Mr. Singer: It is the invisible evidence that's important.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Downsview is looking for invisible evidence. I don't see any of that either!

However, I am encouraged by the progress that I think is being made with respect to the rapid transit situation. I am really quite optimistic that some time relatively soon those people in Metropolitan Toronto, who really have to make the determination as to the exact location of the rapid transit route, will come to a conclusion. Of course, the province is prepared with its portion of the investment that will be necessary to move immediately.

Mr. Speaker, as one looks back over the past 12 months, assesses what has happened in many other jurisdictions, and recognizes the controversy that such a decision as was made a year ago creates, I can only say to the member for York-Forest Hill, with the hindsight that is always very excellent, the government would make exactly the same decision again today.

Mr. Singer: Shame! Where does the Premier want the route to go?

Mr. Lewis: I am not sure the Premier's benches understood they were to applaud. If the Premier could end on a stronger note!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: Contained in the Premier's implied answer is there anything beside the rapid transit line that he has in mind with respect to public transit, that he intends to put into effect before the next anniversary rolls around?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton): is co-chairman of the joint technical committee of Metro and the province, which is exploring the northwest corridor along with other transportation situations in Metro, and I think it would be more appropriate for him to comment on the progress of these deliberations. Quite obviously rapid transit will resolve a great deal of the problem. It may be that other steps will be necessary, and these, of course, I am sure will come out of the technical study committee's report or at the initiative of Metro.

I would say to the hon. member that while this is a very real problem in his riding and for many people in that area of Metropolitan Toronto, I believe, and I believe this most sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that if we don't explore alternatives, if we are not prepared as a government—and I say this to Metro—to find other ways and means of resolving the transportation problems in the city of Toronto and surrounding area, then I would suggest with respect that we have abdicated our responsibilities, because the Spadina Expressway as a single traffic artery would not, in the future of this metropolitan area, resolve the transportation problems. So I say to all of those—

Mr. Singer: Better to do nothing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —concerned—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would say to all of those concerned that we really should dedicate ourselves to being more creative and finding alternatives, because we believe this to be in the long-term interests—

An hon. member: They don't know what they are saying over there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —of this community and think this principle has application in other areas as well.

Mr. Singer: Visibly or invisibly created.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION DISCLOSURE POLICY

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, in reference to the new policy instituted on June 1 by the Quebec Securities Commission involving periodic and surprise examination of brokers' records.

What is the comparable situation in Ontario? Specifically, does the Ontario Securities Commission either institute such surprise and periodic examinations of brokers' records or is it contemplating such? Or is the obligation for this kind of review left with the stock exchange or the brokerage association?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing legislation fairly soon in regard to further requirements of disclosure, which I think will satisfy the hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

EFFECTS OF DISC LEGISLATION

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Will the Premier be accepting the invitation of the officials of the various auto manufacturing centres to discuss the adverse effects of DISC legislation, and what position will the Premier take concerning DISC legislation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, our position I think really was stated very clearly in the municipality that the hon. member represents, I believe it was to the Windsor Chamber of Commerce some few months ago. In my discussions I expressed the concern of the Province of Ontario with respect to any alterations in the auto pact. I made it abundantly clear that we wanted no changes that would adversely affect the automobile producers and parts producers within this jurisdiction.

This view was further supported by my colleague the Minister of Industry and Tourism, and this has been the position of the government. It has been communicated to the first minister of Canada, to the Minister of Trade and Industry, if that is the proper title, and the position of this province has not changed.

The member for Oshawa (Mr. McIlveen) has raised this matter with me. He met some few days ago with representatives in his own municipality along with the heads of municipalities from other areas in the Province of Ontario. I have asked that a meeting be arranged with the member for Oshawa with the representatives from his community and other communities to discuss this matter with them. Mr. Speaker, the position of this province has been stated, stated very clearly, and I think is understood by the federal government.

Mr. B. Newman: Has the Premier set a date for the meeting as yet?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As of noon yesterday a date hadn't been set, but it will be very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

DISMISSAL OF DIRECTOR OF ROM

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask of the Premier, is it the intention of the Premier himself, or is it the intention of his Minister of Colleges and Universities, to meet with the trustees of the Royal Ontaro Museum to discuss the manner in which they determined the firing of Peter Swann?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have not personally indicated that there would be a meeting between myself and the trustees. I think the question might be posed to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. I would expect that he will be discussing this issue with the trustees, if he hasn't already.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Premier: Were you aware of the Price Waterhouse

and Co. report that recommended such a sweeping revamping of the Royal Ontario Museum, and seemed to come down rather harder on the trustees than it did on the director?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have not read the report, so I can't comment on just how it "came down." I would, from just press reports, question whether the interpretation placed upon it by the member for Scarborough West completely reflects the report. I can't comment on this because I haven't read it. I learned of the report two or three days ago; and that is the extent of my knowledge with respect to the report.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: I would like to ask the Premier if he is aware that one of the criticisms is that too many of the members of the board are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council? And therefore this reflects—and this is a view, not their words—something less than a progressive approach to the management?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I don't know what the report itself suggests, but the appointees by the Lieutenant Governor in Council are representative. I don't know what the report suggests, of course, as to what the alternatives would be, or some better method of doing it. I do understand they suggested that the appointees might come from a broader geographic base and, Mr. Speaker, this we support. It is one thing to say it should come from a broader geographic base, it is another thing—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't think it is geography that is the problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, with respect, as I just read the press reports, or heard them—I am not sure which—I think the report did say that there should be representation from outside the general Metro Toronto area on the board. And I think that whether or not the appointees are made by the Lieutenant Governor in Council is really not the relevant issue. The issue is to have people of competence, with interest in the Royal Ontario Museum and, as with any provincial institution, who have the capacity to do the job.

Geography is relevant. I think there should be a wider geographic representation. We have felt this for some time, but it is not that easy to accomplish from the standpoint of the practicality of attendance at meetings. Committee meetings, of course, are a necessary part of the ongoing operation of that particular institution.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I have not read the Price Waterhouse report so I can't comment on it to the members of this House really, other than from what I have read in the press.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the Premier tell us if he is at all concerned about the amounts of severance pay that the public of Ontario is going to have to pay: $83,333 to Mr. Swann and $60,000-odd to Mr. Cauley from the Workmen's Compensation Board? Is the Premier concerned? And if he is concerned, what is he going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is a question of saying whether or not the Premier is concerned. I read with interest the amounts that would be involved if the determination is, as I understand it, as it is presently planned to be.

I would only point out that the directorship of the ROM, leaving personalities out of it, is a very senior position. It is not unusual at least—I know with, say, the university community—for contracts or arrangements with the presidents, who have some form of severance that would be in excess, say, of the three or six months that might be the case in industry.

These are not easy jobs to fill, Mr. Speaker. They are not easy jobs, shall we say, to move from here to some other comparable situation. So that while one might look at the severance pay and say it is excessive, or it is extremely generous, I think, Mr. Speaker, there is wisdom in the board in making this determination; in trying to accommodate the director of the museum.

As I said here on Thursday, I believe he has performed a very excellent service for the ROM and for the people of this province. He is a very creative individual. No one has disputed this—

Mr. Lewis: Well, then why don't you settle in on the board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Why don't you come down on the board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would suggest, with respect, to the member for Scarborough West that it is very easy for him to sit back in this House and criticize without being fully familiar with all the facts, which is rather customary for him.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the board won't reveal the facts. They called a press conference and then refused.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I would say, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Downsview is saying to me that the director of the ROM should be treated in some way substantially less than has been provided for by the board; that is his position. Let him say so; let his leader say so —

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, neither did his leader say so. We are asking you whether you are concerned about the arrangements with the board—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly we are concerned.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the Premier going to do the job?

Mr. Singer: Ridiculous response!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the Leader of the Opposition or the member for Downsview wish to state that the director of the ROM should be treated in some other fashion by way of economic return that would be substantially less than that which the contract calls for, let them say so.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why don't they at least use his services until the end of his contract?

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the Premier, with the clearly mounting public anxiety and without any explanation to the public whatsoever, prepared to allow a board of trustees appointed by his government to behave in such an arbitrary, high-handed and clearly indefensible fashion? They at least require an explanation to the public. How do you fire a man that way without giving cause?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: By giving him $83,000.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the member for Scarborough West, of course, in his fashion as it relates to many of his utterances in the—

Mr. Lewis: What is wrong with giving cause?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —academic world takes a very exaggerated point of view—

Mr. Lewis: If you are going to fire a director, you say why.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and uses adjectives that really aren't relevant for the particular occasion.

Mr. Lewis: I think they are quite relevant.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The board of the ROM was given the responsibility of administering that institution. It was given that responsibility. The members are men and women of competence—

Mr. Lewis: By the Legislature!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was a very difficult situation. They have made a determination—

Mr. Lewis: Without cause. Without the showing of cause.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right, Mr. Speaker, the member for Scarborough West surely should make up his mind. He utters in this House "without cause" and, of course, he recognizes he is completely in error—

Mr. Lewis: Without the showing of cause.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and says now "without the showing of cause."

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Be consistent. In fact, be accurate!

Mr. Lewis: You tell me what cause they had to minister to the public—

An hon. member: They talk about a vague personality conflict.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the hon. member for Scarborough West if he wishes to state that the director of the ROM should, in economic terms, be treated in some way other than he is being treated, he should say so.

Mr. Lewis: I have not raised that. I am asking how the Premier could be satisfied with a board that behaves that way?

Mr. Speaker: Order. There have been a reasonable number of supplementaries. This is developing into a debate.

Mr. MacDonald: I want to ask a simple question—

Mr. Speaker: There will be no more questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: There will be no more questions. There have been sufficient on this topic.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry; what did you say?

Mr. Speaker: There have been sufficient questions on this topic.

Order!

Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have another question?

ENVIRONMENTAL CONFERENCE IN STOCKHOLM

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Premier if one of his peripatetic ministers is designated or delegated to attend the environmental conference in Stockholm?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I guess there are a number who would like to attend the conference in Stockholm.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Actually, we all thought we'd go.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think I can assure the Leader of the Opposition, because obviously he is enthusiastically in support of somebody attending the conference in Stockholm, that I expect there will be some representation from the Province of Ontario—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Send them all.

Mr. Singer: The secretaries are going—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —at that particular conference.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How many ministers are there in Europe right now? Three? Four?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I say, I can't tell the Leader of the Opposition—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —which minister it would be, although I can assure him that I don't think I will be short of volunteers.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Where is the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), for example? Maybe he would be more interested than others.

Mr. Speaker: Order! There is no public importance attached to that question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't think he is very important, either.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

OHC GRANTS FOR LOW RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Revenue, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister extend grants to limited municipal housing companies to aid in the construction of low rental family units similar to those $500 per unit grants available to them for construction of low rental senior citizen housing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we are legally able to meet any claims for grants other than those which are specified in the Act under which OHC and the other pertinent corporations in OHC operate. I will find out what the implications of this are and I'll tell the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

MOOSONEE EDUCATION CENTRE

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Education: What action does the minister propose to take in connection with the petition from nearly 150 residents of Moosonee who are dissatisfied with the operation of the Moosonee Education Centre, and in particular with its director, as a result of his refusal to initiate programmes requested by them, which has recently resulted in the resignation of the assistant director?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, we discussed this at some length yesterday in the estimates. I am not aware of any petition. If there is a petition I will certainly review the situation.

As I indicated to the hon. member yesterday, three or four weeks ago I met with the Rev. Clarke, the chairman of the board of the centre and we had a good discussion about this. My impression from him was that things were moving along very well up there and that the centre was becoming accepted; it was becoming relevant to the community. Since our discussion last night I have had the pleasure of reading a letter written by the hon. member for York South that was published in one of the papers, last summer I think. I thought his comments about what

was going on in Moosonee was very enlightening and relevant.

Mr. MacDonald: It was an expression of hope regarding the objective. Whether the reality matches the hope, I don't know now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's an expression of hope that we all feel about the centre. Certainly, I will review the petition and, as I think I indicated to the hon. member yesterday, I intend to visit Moosonee sometime in the near future.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that will solve it.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary: Will the minister undertake to meet with two or three representatives from that area who are down at the Heritage Ontario conference at the moment and who would be pleased to inform him of some of the problems that they are experiencing?

Mr. Lewis: A very good idea.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would be happy to see if we can arrange a meeting. I expect to be out there this evening and, if it can be arranged this evening, we will sit down with them and have a chat.

Mr. Singer: Investigate the severance pay, too.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier. Has the Premier been successful in finding an alternative source of sand for the Lake Ontario—

Mr. Lewis: Cement Co.

Mr. Burr: —Cement Ltd.?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I personally have not been successful in finding alternatives.

Mr. Ruston: We'll buy the Premier a shovel.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That's getting down to the nitty-gritty.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will inquire from my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) whether those people who have been studying this matter have been successful; but I must confess quite frankly I have not personally been successful in so doing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As soon as he gets back.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Mr. Lewis: Now that the person responsible for studying the matter has been made acting director of the Royal Ontario Museum in the wake of the fracas, who is the Premier going to bring in to rescue the Sandbanks from the devastation of Lake Ontario Cement?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Wait for the minister to come back from wherever he is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it may come as a great shock to the member for Scarborough West, but it is conceivable that the acting director of the ROM will still be able to maintain his activities with respect to the other.

Mr. Lewis: I see. Peter Swann couldn't do it but the new acting director can do it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say it is conceivable. I have not asked him. Mr. Swann was not asked to study the Sandbanks.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the Premier is confident that Mr. Tovell will now be able to. Has Mr. Tovell reported to the government prior to his sudden appointment as acting director?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether Mr. Tovell has reported, but he has been working at it for a period of time. This is why I am relatively optimistic, and I haven't discussed it either with the minister or Mr. Tovell himself, that he probably will be in a position to complete whatever work yet remains.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Labour made a decision as to the appointment—

Mr. Burr: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? All right.

Mr. Burr: Is the Prime Minister aware that Pollution Probe claims that there are five

completely adequate alternative sources of sand for this company?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that Pollution Probe has scientifically determined that there are five viable alternatives for sand. I guess the question of alternatives relates to the proximity to the operation and just what economic impact it would have. I don't know whether Pollution Probe made these determinations in their analysis.

I read somewhere that it did have some suggestions to offer. I am sure the minister would be delighted to receive them. I am not personally aware either of the five sites, and where they are or just how viable an alternative they might be.

Mr. Burr: Will the Premier check into it?

Mr. Speaker: There have been sufficient supplementaries on that.

The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

METRO CIVIC DISPUTE

Mr. Givens: Has the Minister of Labour made a decision as to the appointment of an arbitrator on the Local 43 settlement and, if so, who is he?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Minister of Labour sent a communication to Metro and the city of Toronto as well as CUPE that an umpire in the dispute, or in the settlement in the second year contract, was appointed. His name is His Honour Judge Reville.

Mr. Shulman: Who?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Reville.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Reville

Mr Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a motion. I want to move that the estimates of the Ministry of Labour stand referred to the social development committee in lieu of the resources development committee as previously ordered.

Mr. Lewis: Does that change the list?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No.

Mr. Lewis: And the order?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the estimates of the Ministry of Labour stand referred to the social development committee in lieu of the resources development committee as previously ordered. Shall the motion carry?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, will it be the intention to go on with those when Community and Social Services is finished?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Pardon me, can I have that question again?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't know if I understood it correctly. The motion is we're going to discuss those estimates in the committee—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —and we will not start them until the present work of the committee is completed, that is, dealing with Community and Social Services?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I am sorry to report that is really not the meaning of it. The reason is that the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle) is involved with the Heritage Ontario conference. And so that the entire day is not lost—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This day?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes—the Ministry of Labour has been called.

Mr. Lewis: Well, just a second—whoa! Am I to understand that the House leader is bringing the Labour estimates before the social development committee this morning?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, last night the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch), the chairman of the social development committee, said at adjournment—or if it wasn't at adjournment, it was in the evening—that she was meeting today. She was asked by a member of the committee, how was that since the hon. Minister of Community and Social Services had indicated he couldn't be there on Friday. She smiled. The hon. minister said: "The chairman having told me that I will be there on Friday, I shall be there." He was pressed again and he repeated, "I will be there tomorrow morning."

Now look, Mr. Speaker, we cannot have this kind of thing without any advance warning at all. That is ridiculous. We have an undertaking from the minister that he will be at the committee this morning, we agree to sit on Friday on that basis, and suddenly out of the blue the House leader introduces a new set of estimates. I want to say to the House leader, I know he didn't intend it, but that clearly doesn't make any sense at all.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the hon. member is saying to me, but unless I am totally wrong I believe this was well known last evening.

Mr. Lewis: No!

Mr. MacDonald: No! Not at all!

Mr. Lewis: Not at all, sir. It was checked last evening.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, I'll withdraw the motion.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Right.

Mr. Lewis: I don't think the committee should sit then.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The motion has been placed before the House; the hon. minister chooses to withdraw the motion. Agreed?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Right.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. Hodgson in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
(continued)

On vote 2202:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. B. Newman).

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The member for Windsor West was on his feet when we adjourned, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet when we adjourned last night.

Mr. Chairman: Okay.

An hon. member: That's right.

An hon. member: He's been standing there ever since.

An hon. member: He's been waiting all night.

Mr. Chairman: Did we get over item 1?

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, I was in the middle of my remarks when we adjourned last night.

Mr. Chairman: On item 2?

Mr. Bounsall: On item 2, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, okay.

Mr. Bounsall: No, on vote 2202, item 1.

Mr. Chairman: I wasn't in the chair.

Mr. Bounsall: Item 1 of vote 2202.

Mr. Chairman, these were questions I raised last night, for which there wasn't time to answer before the House adjourned. First, has there been any action taken to establish this committee to determine the additional costs of providing French language education to French-speaking students? I would like to know if there has been any action taken or how soon we might expect that action.

Also, how soon we might expect the task force or whatever sort of task force or committee or study group is required to determine, what is obviously of interest to the minister from his remarks last night, how the needs of the English-speaking community in the field of bilingual education can best be met?

Thirdly, in the area which has been officially designated by the federal government as a bilingual area or any other area where a public board is unwilling to make even a study of the need or desire for French-language schools, will the department take some initiative in encouraging those boards at least to make a survey among the families with children in the school system, particularly those in the lower grades, or those about to enter school, to determine whether they would like to have education for their children in the French language so they can become fluently bilingual.

Fourthly, in the area of financing, in the city of Windsor, where, particularly in the secondary system, the only French-language education is in the separate system, will the department pay additional cost which is determined to arise in giving French-language

education. I can see where there are additional costs. Certainly the cost of text books and library resource material is higher because of the generally lesser availability of this material in French than in English. These additional costs, I would hope, would be extended to schools in either system, irrespective of other situations evolving around that.

Those are the questions I'd like to have answered in the French area, as it pertains to curricula, particularly, and other areas. I believe, maybe a week or two ago, there was an exchange in the House on this other matter. Canada is officially bilingual; it is also officially multicultural. I, for one, can't see how the multiculturalism aspect of our society—and Heritage Ontario is taking place today with the encouragement of this in mind—can take place without education in our school systems in other languages.

In the major centres of Ontario, it seems to me there is no reason why there would not be a demand for education in the Italian language. In any major city, in a city of 100,000 or over, I am sure there would be enough parents wishing their children to get instruction in the Italian language as their means of instruction that it would be feasible to have one elementary school or whatever number of elementary schools is required to meet the need and the demand for instruction to be given in this particular language.

When the immigrant comes to Canada, obviously he needs English as a language and there are programmes set up in our various education institutions to provide for that. His children are, by and large, bilingual —English from the school system and whatever their native language is from home. But when these children marry, if they wish to retain any sort of cultural identity, and I point out that we are officially multicultural in this country, in order that their children be able to speak with their grandparents it would be of great advantage, and some of them strongly desire it for their children—grandchildren of the original immigrants—to receive instruction in school in their native language. This wouldn't necessarily add great amounts of additional cost; but I can't see why this cannot be done for any ethnic group, irrespective of what language it is, if there are enough in a community to allow one whole elementary school as a start to give language instruction in that native language.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether the hon. member really believes what he says. Surely he's not suggesting that in this province we should embark upon a multitude of languages in our schools as languages of instruction. I think that this could probably be one of the most harmful moves that we could make for the educational development of this province. He's indicating that the language of instruction throughout the whole elementary school should be, for instance, Italian, or Ukrainian or something.

Mr. Bounsall: Where there's sufficient demand.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, where there's sufficient demand. But this is perpetuating a situation where these people will be perhaps, to their detriment, not encouraged to learn English, which, obviously, they're going to have to speak to benefit from the advantages of living in Ontario and Canada. I certainly support him in underlining and stressing that we should protect their cultural heritage, and we wish to do this. We have indicated our willingness to do this, for instance, by indicating that where the need is demonstrated we will introduce credit courses in these languages in the secondary school. Courses in Hebrew and Ukrainian, in Italian and Hungarian and others will be introduced in some schools, I'm told.

Through the study of the language, the study of the culture of these peoples will be perpetuated, and this will be perpetuated for these students. I think that the whole thrust of what we've been meeting with people recently about, our friends in the Italian community and the Ukrainian community, is how best to bridge them into our system, not with the ultimate aim, and I stress this and they stress this to me, of changing the school system to their native language. They don't want this, as we don't. They want to be able to have a mix, say, in the early kindergarten era, or in other grades when they come from Italy at 11 and 12.

This is what our experiments are now trying to prove—whether, in fact, if we give some of the courses in their native tongue, as the language of instruction, with the ultimate end, at, say, the end of one or two years, to move them in the regular stream. They have then overcome any handicap that they might have had if we had stressed that in the beginning they come in and immediately concentrate on learning English and use English as the full language of instruction in the school system. We certainly heartily support this kind of experimentation and, indeed, we are supporting it and we're encouraging that

it be done and we want to see what the results of it will be. But I can't agree with my friend's other comments.

In regard to his questions about the French-language schools and French-language instruction, I think I indicated in my comments about bilingual schools, the desire of a large part of the Anglophone community to have access to more than just the instruction in French that's now available, say, in the elementary school, and perhaps to have an even greater immersion in French in the secondary school. That will be in the study of the task force, which I indicated last night will be set up very shortly, as recommended in the Symons report.

At the same time, while we set the task force up, we're encouraging boards to move ahead and experiment and innovate in this particular area, as I know many boards are presently doing. The question of a task force or a committee to study the costs involved in providing French-language instruction will be the duty of the Council on French-Language Schools. They're presently completely immersed in the work that they have to do. They're presently evaluating the major recommendations of the Symons report, all the recommendations concerning the French-language advisory committees, the recommendation that there be a linguistic rights commission, the availability and number of staff and who they should be in the department to serve the French-language school system.

Dr. Carrière and his committee are working hard on this at the present time to do the backup work for myself and the government on this particular aspect of the Symons report.

In regard to the city of Windsor, in the interval I made some inquiries about what was happening and I was told that at the secondary level in the city of Windsor—and this is the report that I received—following a survey by both the Francophone community and the Windsor board, which was done two to three years ago, a bilingual programme—50 per cent English, 50 per cent French—was established at the Windsor High School of Commerce. It offered grade 9 and 10 programmes in 1971-1972 and will inauguarate grade 11 programmes this September.

Despite every effort to encourage involvement on the part of the board and the Francophone community, no more than 45 new students have enrolled each year. The board is on record as indicating that it is willing to have the entire school turned over to this purpose if sufficient enrolment can be generated. Further, I am told that the Windsor board has indicated its willingness to meet with the Essex county board to discuss a joint venture in this particular area.

As I say, my reports are that the Windsor board has certainly considered this, has made surveys and has indicated a certain willingness to move ahead.

Mr. Bounsall: On this point, Mr. Chairman, as the minister admitted last night, the time for learning a second language and becoming bilingual is at a very early age. What the Windsor board has refused to do, and as recently as two years ago when I was determined to get my daughter into an entirely French-speaking school, is to make a survey to start at least one school in the Windsor area in the elementary system entirely in the French language, where right from kindergarten on one could have children receive instruction purely and simply in the French language.

That is the point on which they refuse, it appears, to make a survey. They were certainly asked to do it about two years ago. They came out with a categorical statement that there was no need for it, and when questioned on that they had not made a survey at all and would not make a survey to start with kindergarten and perhaps grade 1 and proceeding through the elementary system.

To take students at the secondary school level and encourage them to take half their courses in French or saying half of the programme in the high school be French, just doesn't meet the need. Someone who has gone through English training, whether he comes from a French-speaking or English-speaking background, finds that proposition rather unattractive at that stage of his training. What is needed is the encouragement by boards to commence instruction completely in the French language within the elementary system, starting with kindergarten, for the French-speaking people in the area or any English-speaking people who would wish it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course there are French elementary schools for the Francophones in that area in the separate school system. I suppose that across the province most of our French-language instruction schools for Francophones are in the separate school system at the elementary level at this point in time; the vehicle is there for the board to set up the school if it wishes, I suppose, but again this is a question of local autonomy.

We put special weighting factors in our grant regulations to encourage boards to introduce French-language programmes and we certainly recommend them. I suppose we arrive at the point where we must ask, do the wishes of the Windsor board sort of become paramount? The Windsor school board, elected by the people in Windsor, should reflect their viewpoint, and the people of Windsor have a chance to—I don't know what the term of office there is now—

Mr. Bounsall: Three years.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But every two years from now on they will have the opportunity to express their opinion to the Windsor board.

The whole question of bilingual education —that is, using French as a language of instruction in more than just what we are perhaps talking about in the public elementary schools, where conversational French is a course that's taught. That's the kind of thing that this task force will be looking at to see if there are ways in which this can be encouraged to a greater degree.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak concerning the teaching of languages other than English, but not on a regular day basis, or not in the regular classroom structure in the school, but on an after-school basis. Many of the ethnic groups in the community would like the opportunity of teaching their own native tongue in the schools of the province, rather than going into their own ethnic halls. The classroom environment is more conducive than is a hall that is used for practically everything but education, in the strict sense of meaning education purposes.

Now, the department has hesitated to provide any type of assistance in the promotion of this other language. I think it is a wrong step. I think you should encourage this, Mr. Minister, not only from the point of view that the culture of that individual is maintained and developed, but also from the point of view that we live in a multicultural society. We should encourage this type of educational approach. It does add to the overall benefit of the community and to the benefit of the country itself.

Your department shouldn't hesitate to financially assist the teaching of it, even if the financial assistance is solely in the way of grants; so that the organization or group, or ethnic group, would not have to pay rental fees when it comes to the teaching of the language in that school.

Is the department considering some assistance to ethnic groups for the teaching of their native tongue? I don't mean anything other than the cultural ability to speak the language in the school system on an after-school basis, or an evening basis.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I would support the hon. member's contention that the use of the school facilities in after-school hours for this kind of programme would be worthwhile and one which we would encourage; just as we encourage complete use of the schools in as many hours of the day as possible. I think it would be up to the local boards to decide whether they wish to charge for this or not. As I indicated last night, many boards have a very long and varied list of groups, associations and organizations who get free use of the schools.

It just occurs to me that perhaps the support, if any support were to come financially because of the cultural benefit of this type of programme, probably should come through our community services branch in the Ministry of Community and Social Services. This branch has broad responsibilities to support the cultural development of many of the groups that make up this province of ours. Perhaps this would be a better way of supporting it. Because there are many groups who use schools for their purposes, quite apart from language instruction, who perhaps would feel that they were just as equally entitled to some kind of financial support.

Mr. B. Newman: To continue with the subject, Mr. Minister: one of the drawbacks is that the department does not assist the boards financially with this extra burden. The boards can budget for it, and it can be considered an extra expenditure; but there isn't the financial inducement to encourage the boards to make it available. Now you may say, Mr. Minister, that very few boards would hesitate to allow any ethnic group to teach the language in their school system on an after-school basis, but there still isn't the financial inducement.

May I ask the minister if, in the setting up of the curriculum and the credit system, the department has considered giving a credit to the individual who takes this ethnic language and meets certain standards; who takes the language on an after-school basis. Rather than having him get his 27 credits in the regular school system, he could also take his own native language, or the native language of his parents, on an after-school, Saturday or an evening basis; and still get credit for it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, Mr. Chairman, to receive credits in these language credit courses which are available the student must take the course under the auspices of the school; these courses that are offered and the instruction in the school.

Mr. B. Newman: All right. Then cannot there be some accommodation to encourage the development of the various cultures in the given community by considering this a credit course? There should be some way that you can do this.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I don't think we have a quorum.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Shulman: Can we have a quorum?

Mr. Chairman: There is a quorum.

Mr. B. Newman: There is more than a quorum, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): High Park for leadership.

Mr. B. Newman: May I have an answer to that from the minister? Is there not some way of accommodating the ethnic community—I shouldn't say the community but the individual, by giving him credit in the taking of the language of his parents on an after-school or an evening basis? There should be some way of accommodating them.

Hon. Mr. Wells: At this point in time, Mr. Chairman, we feel that the credits should be gained through the in-school programme. It raises a variety of questions concerned with a lot of other areas, not language instruction taken on an after-school basis but other areas, and we think that at least until we have had time to evaluate the present credit system the new provisions to allow boards to introduce these courses of languages into the credit system and into their high schools and collegiates are a real step forward in helping to preserve the culture of many of our ethnic groups in the province. And we think this is the best direction to be taken to get the credit.

Mr. B. Newman: Looking over some of the credit courses at one of the schools in the city of Toronto I see no other ethnic language other than French. I shouldn't even call French an ethnic language—

Mr. Foulds: Other languages are ethnic languages.

Mr. B. Newman: —it's a native language. Should there not be other languages added to the programmes?

Hon. Mr. Wells: This is only in its infancy, as you know. It was only announced last year. Some of them have got going this year. It is going to take two or three years for the various ethnic groups to get together to ask the boards to set up the courses. But I think in two or three years we will see quite a diversity of languages where there is the demand and need for them, and a number of students who are interested in them.

Mr. B. Newman: I will accept that, Mr. Minister, and I hope that the department does move quite rapidly once it finds that there is the request and the demand and the desire for the promotion of ethnic culture and the ethnic languages. May I inform the minister of the brief presented to Heritage Ontario today by the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee? They make a suggestion which I think merits consideration on the part of the department. The committee recommends that the Minister of Education create departmental branches to revise school curricula placing greater emphasis on various ethnic cultures. It recommends a similar revision of textbooks and other educational material and the appointment of a Deputy Minister of Education to develop programmes in the teaching of ethnic cultures. This is right in line with what we have been discussing, Mr. Minister, and I hope that you do take it into consideration.

May I ask of the minister why some compulsory subjects aren't included in the curricula of the school system?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I covered much of this in my opening remarks about the basis of the new curriculum and the new credit system, and the development of a system to encourage and develop and bring about sense of responsibility and sharing and the learning process among students and teachers in the school system. It is our feeling that this new system of choice helps the student to play a greater part in picking and choosing his own programme of education.

I think the sad part about this is that the process has been over-emphasized by a lot of people in criticizing the credit system who say that they are just going to choose helter-skelter, as someone said here in the House, as if going down with a tray to the cafeteria and picking a bit of this and a bit of that. In fact I just don't think that this will happen, because it places responsibility on the student,

responsibility on the guidance people, responsibility on the teachers, to plan a programme for a student. It doesn't force anyone into a particular mould. It doesn't attempt, if the student doesn't wish it to be done, to prejudge what he is going to do when he gets out of the secondary school. It lets him plan a course that he and his parents and his teachers think can be beneficial to him.

As I say, this wasn't arrived at by just pulling something out of the air. It was done based on experimentation over the past three or four years in schools. Some of the results have shown that students have actually accepted this responsibility and, in fact, accepted it to a very great degree and in a manner surprising, I think, to some of the educational officials who, perhaps, had some qualms about the new system.

As I indicated the other day and as I know the hon. member knows, you have to pick one credit out of each of four study areas. A lot of the schools are developing tables which show that if your ultimate end is at a teachers' college, here are some suggested credits. If your aim is university, if your aim is to work in an office or if your aim is in other places, they work out tables to assist you. They work out programmes to show you subject areas which you can take if you are interested in a particular occupation.

I think that this is good because it involves everybody in the process rather than having a kid come in and be told, "This is the course; here is your timetable; away you go." This is the kind of direction we have been hearing of from many people over the past number of years. This is the kind of direction we have been told the system should take, and I think that it is going to prove to be beneficial to the students and beneficial to society as a whole.

I guess we will not really know until we are able to evaluate it some time in the future. That, of course, I would underline, is one of the key matters we have to evaluate, because too often in education we accept something. We move into it but we never evaluate. We are now, having introduced this system, going to evolve evaluation procedures so that two or three or four years hence we will, hopefully, be able to evaluate the entire process.

Mr. B. Newman: Am I to assume the minister has no intention of making any of the subjects compulsory in the school system?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We have no intention of making any core subjects compulsory, certainly for the immediate future; that is, for the next school year. We continually monitor the programme. As I say, we will be continually evaluating it, talking with the principals in the schools, the teachers, the teachers' groups and the students. We will get all kinds of feedback and if it looks as though these suggested changes have to be made, then they will be considered.

Mr. B. Newman: I know the minister is familiar with the report of the Ontario physical fitness study committee, produced in 1961, tabled in 1963, and its recommendations. I was with the minister on the select committee on youth and know the recommendations they made concerning physical education and the lack of physical fitness on the part of school-attending youth.

Is the minister not concerned with the physical fitness of youth attending our school system? Does he not think that if one subject in the school should be compulsory that is physical education to see that our youth are at least semi-healthy? When we compare our physical development and our achievement in international competition, we see that Canada as a nation certainly doesn't rank anywhere near the top when it comes to Olympic, world, or even pan-American games competitions?

Is there not a responsibility on the part of the educational system to see that we not only develop the mind of the individual but that the body is fit? Does the minister not believe in a sound mind in a sound body?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I certainly do. I believe that every young person, as well as developing intellectually, should develop, using the old phrase, spiritually and physically. I am not so sure, though, that compulsory physical education has achieved this for us in the past or, indeed, is the way to go about this. I think that there are perhaps better ways of doing this.

You say confession is good for the soul—I recall that at the University of Toronto one of the things I hated the most was the fact that they had compulsory physical education. I couldn't swim and they said the only thing I could do was take swimming. Consequently for two years I missed all the compulsory physical education classes because I hated the water and hated swimming.

It was an absolutely ridiculous rule, I thought, for the university to insist first that

you had to have compulsory physical education and second that if you couldn't swim, you couldn't even play basketball or do anything else until you took the swimming.

You see, that kind of motivation, I think, is absolutely wrong. It is far better to offer the programmes and say, "We encourage you to use them." I'll bet more people would have been encouraged to use these programmes. The same thing, I think, will occur in our high schools now. Perhaps with physical education now also being a subject of choice, there will be more interest in developing programmes that are suited to the students rather than pushing them into preconceived ideas of what students should be doing in the physical education field. I certainly think that this can be accomplished without making physical education compulsory. I think that a lot of other things in motivating our young people have to be done to encourage them to develop healthy bodies and we can do this in a lot of other ways.

Mr. B. Newman: I can see nothing other than downgrading of physical education in the philosophy of the minister here. I regret that because, using exactly his same approach—

Mr. Foulds: It is not a downgrading; it is an upgrading.

Mr. B. Newman: —I made mention that an individual could attend for four years in a secondary school, only take one fourth-year subject and still get his high school graduation certification. In a lot of job applications, all you are asked is, "Have you completed grade 12?" Now the individual has completed grade 12, yet you wouldn't be able to equate him intellectually or mentally with one who has taken the harder programme in the school; but he doesn't necessarily need to take that harder programme. So just as he would opt out of physical education because it might be a little difficult for him to engage in some of the activity, likewise that same individual or other individuals will opt out of the more difficult programmes in the academic stream. They will take, as sometimes they are referred to by others but not by myself, Mickey Mouse courses in the school system. I don't use that term at all. I am only quoting others who have used it. However I would prefer—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can't remember what we took under the compulsory physical education; but there is certainly not much that I use or that keeps me physically fit now. If it's an option now, maybe some of the schools will teach tennis or something like this that—

Mr. Foulds: Soccer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Roller skating.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —a person can for many years—just—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Even that is in question now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —or recognize that jogging and walking is a good physical activity. Maybe if you walk or if you jog around the track for one period, that's as good as doing gymnastics, which may not suit every student.

Mr. B. Newman: Apparently, then, the minister doesn't believe that the physical education programme in the school system is worthwhile. He doesn't believe that they do have a variety of programmes to affect all physical levels of individuals. He thinks the phys-ed programmes in the schools today are the same kind he took when he attended school and he doesn't think that some of the phys-ed programmes in the schools have carryover activity. Not everyone takes football, but they do have golf in the schools; they do have tennis. You name it, and they practically do have it in the phys-ed programme, all adding to the physical well-being of the individual, but if it is the minister's approach—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am happy to hear that.

Mr. B. Newman: —that the physical well-being of the individual is not one of the prime requisites in attendance at school—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I didn't say that.

Mr. B. Newman: That's what you are inferring.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I said I believe the students should develop intellectually, spiritually and physically and that I think these all should be accomplished equally. I certainly completely subscribe to the view that the physical development of young people is of utmost importance.

Mr. B. Newman: You may subscribe to it, but you don't come along and prove your real concern in the programming that you have scheduled for the individual. May I ask the minister, concerning grade 13, why does the department list certain courses with the figure 5? Why not list the highest number of four courses only, so that if the indi-

vidual wishes he can come along and complete his academic schooling in four years and not have that mental block that he must be taking 5 programmes—programmes with the number 5, 500 programmes, 515, 521; you name it. They are all considered grade 13 or level 5 programmes.

Mr. Foulds: Level 6 too.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am informed that the coding of courses is a local matter. We don't code those. That must be the way they are doing them in the schools or the school system in a particular area.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): I would like to return to the subject that two other speakers talked about, which is the other languages besides French and English in schools.

I want to tell you a hard-luck story by way of exemplifying problems in curriculum development as experienced by immigrants and children of immigrants. It is a personal hard-luck story.

For those who have not guessed my origin, I would like to establish my credentials. I am an immigrant and, fortunately, my hard-luck story ends happily. Possibly, of course, I am hardly typical of that third of the Toronto population who are immigrants and non-Anglo-Saxon.

When I left Poland at the age of 14 I went to England, where almost within two months, on a very conscious decision by my parents, I was put in an English boarding school. There, for the next six months, I was not allowed to use my own language, all in a major attempt to teach me English. I survived that experience somewhat, without really ever completely mastering English or completely forgetting Polish.

Admittedly, this is an English experience, when the Polish minority at the end of the war and for the first few years after the war was something like 150,000 Polish people in a context of a very homogeneous national population. There was really no way of dealing with it except perhaps in this fashion: that to survive in England an immigrant in fact has to have a complete and reasonable command of the English language.

It is not quite the same here. I think that to survive here, and to show any type of upward mobility, you do have to have a full command of English. But when you look at the ethnic origins of the city of Toronto, for example, there are now 44 per cent of the people, according to the latest figures, who in fact are not Anglo-Saxons. It is a completely different problem.

The problems of the children of immigrants are real, and I think the crisis in the field of education lies in the inadequate structure of the school system, which does not meet and does not answer the requirements of society as a whole.

As might be expected, such a massive influx of people from countries so different among themselves in culture, in tradition, in history and in mentality but, above all, so different from the main Canadian ethnic group, could not be expected to be calmly and easily swallowed without raising turmoil and disruption.

Confronted by this explosive situation in the city of Toronto, which in the last 10 years has doubled its population, and probably doubled its ethnic population, authorities such as your ministry and your predecessor's ministry have thought it adequate to continue the expansion of the present institutions simply by repeating those models erected before the immigrant influx of the postwar years.

A principal, naturally or maybe now usually Anglo-Saxon, was assigned to every school, and all students, whether Italians, Greek or Portuguese were obligated to attend the same courses and learn the same concept as their English peers. In many ways, as happened to me, the children of the immigrants are being moulded into little Anglo-Saxons—or when I was in school I was being moulded into a little English gentleman. It took me years to shed some of the accoutrements.

Mr. Foulds: You have been quite successful.

Mr. Dukszta: There is no doubt, however, that the education authorities of this city are convinced of the impossibility of transforming the immigrant children into so many Anglo-Saxons. I think I do accept this, and I accept that, probably within the context of your ministry, or yourself, you realize this.

The school system nevertheless has solely and simply attempted to absorb the newly arrived children, obligating them in some sense to be more assimilated than integrated, losing some of their ethnic cultural characteristics in time.

Young people who come to Canada pose probably the greatest problem when they have

already completed some part of their education. I was 14 years when I came here and it was my third switch in language. This has a tremendous implication for people when they are at that age. I think the school authorities have been unable automatically to integrate such a large number of students with the established system. So they have turned to a rather hasty solution. They did not, as some would naively believe, try to find a new way to facilitate the integration of the students within the system. I think what has happened is that the authorities have created special schools called vocational schools, that up to the present have proven to be, on the whole, disastrous. They destine a considerable number of young people to a life of menial labour in which their parents have been and are employed.

This particular accusation of streaming the children of ethnic parents toward a vocational school is well supported now by evidence, from figures from your department and also from the Wright report. If we compare a number of groups—the Italian, the Portuguese, the Chinese, the American, and then a choice, select group of the children of the, let's say, English professional classes—we find that very few Chinese in fact go to the vocational school, they tend to end up in the five-year course. It is predominantly the Italian and the Portuguese who end up in vocational schools. And when you look at the children of the professional classes, Mr. Minister, you find that up to 89 per cent of the children of the professional classes end up in five-year courses which give them an opportunity of going to university.

I am never quite clear why this is done. I am not going to say it is done because the immigrants are considered second-class citizens. I don't accept this, nor do I think you accept it. It is partly because it is an easier way of doing it when you are faced with the kid who has switched languages and has some difficulty in making the grade. It has nothing to do with the level of intelligence, because I would say that intelligence is distributed evenly between the various groups, and it is only our apparatus of measuring intelligence which can be at fault, since it is very culture-bound, specifically culture-bound in terms of university graduates of American Anglo-Saxon schools.

Here, I think, we have to question whether by doing this, by streaming to the vocational schools so many of the children of immigrants, it is the authority's intention to provide a steady pool of unskilled labour, and I think that is against all the major principles of our country at the moment.

It does seem that the only way we can look at it is that this is an attempt to keep the children of the ethnic families always in the lowest socio-economic strata. This is, I think, a very selfish and shortsighted tactic, which in the long run will produce incalculable damage to the entire society. It will suppress energies that would otherwise be tapped in productive and beneficial employment.

Heavy immigration into Ontario during the last 20 years has brought extensive changes in the social and cultural patterns in many urban centres. The effects, actual and potential, have not yet been generally realized.

A thing we must always remember is that 44 per cent of this city now stems from non-Anglo-Saxon origins and non-Anglo-Saxon parents. The potential cultural changes that may occur in the city are incalculable at the moment.

Many sons and daughters of parents of the Italian group; and I am going to use the Italian group paradigmaticly, since it is the biggest group at the moment and has most of the problems. It is also the most articulate, in some senses. This group is now reaching the state of young adulthood, conscious of being both Canadian and Italian; yet receiving little encouragement to maintain its ancestral language and culture. There is a danger that these young people will be alienated if they are not accepted for what they are and encouraged; not merely to conform to existing Canadian patterns, but also to cherish their native heritage as a value, as a new element to enrich Canadian culture and life.

To return to my personal hard-luck story, when I graduated from that particular school I was Anglicized to an extent that I had difficulties in dealing with my own parents, since there was a tension set up in which I felt different from my own parents and I think something is lost in the process. This is something that we must try to avoid—knowing now the effect it has had on many children of immigrant parents in the USA.

The children and the families often live in geographically defined areas; so-called Italian communities. Now some of them, through schools and other organizations, are constantly drawn into the life outside. I think Ontario should avoid at all costs a situation not uncommon in the United States in which Italian-Americans come to feel ashamed of their origin.

There are occasional signs of a similar incipient attitude in Ontario. The position is

not helped by the general attitude in the press and among native-born Canadians who believe that the Italian communities consist exclusively of manual workers who preserve quaint customs in the ritual events of life—in food, drink—but who are totally devoid of any cultural interests.

I think we often tend to associate the word "culture" with other ethnic groups; it is curiously associated with all the God-awful dancing that goes on, as if it were the only sign of the culture that ethnic groups have brought to this country. Indeed, I think the press rarely if ever associates the word "culture" with the Canadians of Italian origin or, for that matter, of other origins.

I think to assist the young people already mentioned, and so that all citizens may come to know and understand an increasingly important component of what is "Canadian"—a component that is bound sooner or later to affect their lives—Italian language and culture, or Polish language and culture, or Ukrainian language and culture, should be maintained, and a knowledge of them be more widely diffused.

In the schools there is a need to help students of Italian or other ethnic origin to properly learn their own language; they often speak it only in dialect. At the same time, the other students would benefit by language knowledge—the Italian language and culture, for example. This would bridge the gap between them and their fellow Canadians and would make clear this latest contribution to Canadian life. About 55 public and separate high schools in the province now offer Italian in their curriculum; and for this I think the ministry should be congratulated. It has found a ready response. High schools in Italian or semi-Italian areas have often introduced the subject at the request of students. Most principals, though not all, have shown themselves to be understanding and co-operative. Some schools have classes for beginners and more even advanced in the Italian language. The teaching of Italian should be encouraged in schools in non-Italian areas for purposes of mutual understanding which could lead to a lessening of the present atmosphere of the ghetto.

In Parkdale Collegiate School, there is now a language course in Polish, since the predominant ethnic group in the Parkdale area is Polish. That, again, has been welcomed intensely and appreciatively by the Polish ethnic group.

An increasing number of students of ethnic origin now attend Ontario universities, though again their proportion does not correspond to the relevant proportion of the population in areas such as Toronto. This probably will come in time. An example of the whole approach, which is not in your department. but I may remark about it nevertheless, is that there is a combined Italic-Hispanic department in the University of Toronto when they should really be very separate departments, one concentrating entirely on the Italian language and culture, since there's such a large group present in the City of Toronto.

When you look at book 4 of the report of the royal commission, especially recommendations 3 and 5—sorry, the report of the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism —recommendations 3 and 5 advocate the teaching of languages other than English and French in elementary and high schools where there is sufficient demand for them. Recommendation 7 says universities especially should expand their studies in the field of the humanities and the social sciences relating to particular areas other than those related to the English and French languages.

Since education is entirely your responsibility, I hope to urge you to give speedy and sympathetic consideration to these recommendations. I think it is the duty of your department to provide leadership based on an awareness of the problems, an awareness which appears lacking, I think, at the moment, in the office of the deputy minister.

A request earlier this year, supported by a petition signed by something like 228 university students for the introduction of an interim high school assistant certificate type A in English and Italian was met with a short, procrastinating reply which showed no knowledge of the deep issues at stake or the feelings involved. The office was no doubt surprised by the subsequent sharp reaction in the Italian-language press.

The Department of Education has a tremendous opportunity here for positive action as part of the government of Ontario programme which would serve as a model, far beyond the boundaries of the province, of a society priding itself on the diverse strands that together form the unity of its texture.

I would like to ask the minister whether he would be prepared to act on some of these points? Some of the points I have brought up have been brought up already in a brief presented to your predecessor by the Italian community. I wonder, would it be possible for you to make a more clear statement of interest and concern and support for

educational cultural projects proposed by the appropriate organizations in the ethnic sector, to be expressed in more relevant legislation.

I think you should adopt and announce a clear policy of encouragement of the teaching of Italian and other languages in high schools. Since your budgetary restrictions perpetuate the status quo and prevent introduction of new subjects, the department should consider making exceptions in cases falling under recommendation 2. I think you should make a provision for the teaching of Italian in elementary schools where the demand is sufficient. This may not be fully within your department, nevertheless programmes involving the study of Italian language and culture should be encouraged in all Ontario universities. An investigation possibly should be made about the feasibility of a cultural agreement with Italy which would permit special cultural arrangements and exchanges.

I would suggest that in the context of an officially accepted multicultural society more than just a token gesture should be made toward the languages and cultures of the large minorities of the city of Toronto. In this discussion, you have mentioned that one of the major difficulties involved in teaching young kids in the language of their origin is that they do not then become adept in the usage of English, and that handicaps them afterwards for the life of normal "social mobility" which is supposed to characterize our society.

I think it is now becoming generally accepted that this is probably not so; and that the best way for a kid to learn two languages is if he is exposed simultaneously within the ages of three to six to two languages. If the Italian kid or the Polish kid is taught in the language of his origin, between those ages, in kindergarten and the first grades of elementary school, and not solely in the English language, not only will it not detract from his future career, but in the main part it will be helpful for him to learn both English and to keep intact his original language as much as is possible to the enrichment both of the individual and the community generally.

I am aware, too, that to teach in Italian in the primary grades, there will be a necessity for employing more Italian teachers, which in itself can be a problem. Nevertheless, an effort should be made by the ministry to do this by involving more Italian teachers. So, my suggestion is extremely tentative, since you have already in a way responded by saying that it's highly unlikely to be done. Yet there is now a lot of evidence that it may be a very feasible thing for those kids who want to be taught in their own language to be taught in that language in the first grades before switching without any detriment to the language at large, which is English.

I would urge that it should be done. This seems to be more and more a desire of many ethnic groups. I disagree strongly with you that the ethnic communities don't have this desire. I have fairly intensive contact, not only with the Italian group but with my own, and I would say, in spite of our ethnic desire to be upwardly mobile, nevertheless, there is now a definite trend and feeling among the many members of ethnic communities that we want to preserve a part of our heritage from the past, hopefully without in any sense inferring with the fact that we are also part of the community right now. It is, hopefully, within reach of both sides.

I think that maybe that is enough and that you could answer some of the rhetorical questions I raised.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I think that I would thank the hon. member for his comments. I don't know that I am really going to say too much about this subject at the present time. I think that a lot of the points the hon. member has put forward are the very things that are being discussed this minute at the Heritage Ontario conference. It was called to consider many of these things concerning our multicultural environment in this province and, certainly, the area of education and language is one that I am sure he is aware is being discussed.

One of the things that I think that they are going to discuss, and which is of vital importance, in looking at this from a balanced point of view, is how far can we go with multicultural diversity, and still maintain a distinctive Canadian identity. And I think that is the question we all have to answer and we are all working toward.

I know one of the subjects they are considering at Heritage Ontario is something concerning names; there is the old phrase, "What's in a name?" Perhaps it doesn't necessarily indicate what we would perhaps think it indicates, but I was told the other day at the convocation up at the University of Waterloo that of 19 PhD degrees that were conferred, only six of the recipients had Anglo-Saxon names. And in the list of Ontario Scholars that I see every year of people who excelled in our educational sys-

tem, the diversity of names there would seem to me to indicate a multitude of cultural and ethnic backgrounds. They are certainly not missing from that list—

Mr. Dukszta: I am not suggesting that they are stupid. By no means.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In fact, there is a great number of them there.

I think these are certainly the kinds of things that will be being very actively considered by all of us in education, including those at the local level, because a lot of the responsibility for this rests at the local levels, particularly in a major city like Metropolitan Toronto, where I suppose this problem is much more acute, and comes much more to the fore than it does in a lot of sections of Ontario.

It will be considered, and I hope that some of the input we get out of Heritage Ontario will be helpful, because I understand there are well over 1,000 delegates there and many of them will be spending all of the next three days discussing some of these very things. We are looking forward to finding out the kind of suggestions that they bring forward to us.

Mr. Dukszta: Can I just comment? Like the minister I do hope some ideas will come out of Heritage Ontario that will give you, so to speak, raw material for future legislation.

I just wanted to pick you up at one point, and then I will shut up. It is the way you use the terms "multiculturalism" and "Candian identity." I think there was a thesis and an antithesis set up in what you said. I think "Canadian identity" or "Ontario identity" is a broader term than I think you have suggested. There are no tensions between multiculturalism and Canadian identity. I suggest that your statement is somewhat of a reflection of your approach toward the problem of multiculturalism, because being a Canadian or an Ontarian now involves the context of having all other groups involved besides the two founding nations.

When you look at who lives in Toronto—and I know it's not completely typical of all of Canada—up to 44 per cent are people who may not have the same feeling as you have as to what is Canadian. It now has become much broader, which does not deny the intensity of their national feeling toward the country of adoption.

You must always remember after all, I think, that the people who come choose, and that makes them choose to come; they want to come, which in many respects gives them a stronger involvement with the country of their adoption than if they were even born here.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I just want to say that I guess what we are really striving for is to be sure that the students in our schools, and those students who are native to Canada, have this same feeling for the perpetuation of their cultural background and their ideas so that we can establish this distinctive Canadian identity, which is the thing that we are being told has not been stressed enough in this country. We are working toward this, and we just have to be sure that the balance is kept, we have to be sure that we are indeed developing a distinctive Canadian identity in our students, and that is what I am really stressing.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just two things on another subject: The minister last night under this vote raised the matter of the abolition of grade 13, and since there really wasn't a chance to exchange views because of the way the debate, so-called, was fitting together last night, I just want to draw to his attention that when he expressed a difficulty in compacting five years work into less than five, I interjected that there seemed to be an unnatural barrier here separating the primary level from the secondary level, an unnatural barrier in the mind of the minister which I think should be withdrawn, because any thought that we could achieve our present level of academic attainment or educational attainment at the secondary level by reducing the course, compacting it into 2 grades plus kindergarten, certainly calls for curriculum changing and a different approach at levels below grade 9.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I will accept that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All of this conversation becomes academic in another sense. People don't talk about grades any more. It is interesting that my kids when they come home from Paris District High School now talk about level 5. Next thing they are going to be calling it fifth form and the wheel is going to be all the way around again.

Certainly there have been dramatic changes with the removal of the external examination. I favoured the removal of the external examination, although I felt at the time when the

previous Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) did it that it was largely because he was having more and more difficulty getting the exams marked. I think that was sort of the operative thing. But anyway, the exams are gone and it means that education is very different now, that my son in grade 13 doesn't really have any exams at all and he is going to come home early this afternoon to cut the lawn.

An hon. member: You hope!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's a fact. Well it had better be cut when I get home!

When I compare that with the pressure and attitude of young people who, let's say, were taking grade 13 a few years ago—like 1946—it really is a change indeed. But in my view we could with ease and efficiency improve the whole milieu of the students, we could in fact have kindergarten and 12 levels within which groups of subjects could be established so that young persons could achieve at least as high a level as we achieve now in only 12 years following kindergarten. As a matter of fact we might even do better than that. I would just say to the minister that while I don't think there is any point in us having a sort of knock-down argument about it now, I hope that his thinking in this is not in any way atrophied. I think there was some indication of, let's say, incipient atrophy last night when he was talking about doing something with those five grades.

The second thing I want to raise is something that crept into one of his answers last night, something about—what do you call it when you don't have the education in classrooms, everybody walks into a big room and just sort of sits around?

Mr. Stokes: Open concept.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Open concept, right. Well there is a lot of concern about this, not only among teachers but among parents and presumably among students too, although they seem to get along whatever we do for them or to them

An hon. member: Or in spite of them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But I was noticing that the Brant County School Board—and surely you will forgive this parochialism, or provincialism, or whatever it is—was saying that we are going to tear down the two elementary schools in St. George, Ont. One of them was built as recently as 1886 and the other one isn't in such good shape. But the schools are going to be torn down and a new one is going to be put up, and somebody on the board was murmuring about doing us a big favour and building us a school with this open concept, and it may very well be a big favour. But when the minister said: "I am not so sure that that is the answer to all of our problems, and maybe new schools ought to have one floor open and one floor closed and one floor different," I get that terrible feeling that nobody really knows what to do under these circumstances.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Sounds like an open and shut case!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am concerned about the expenditure of the funds in my own community and the education that is going to be provided. I will tell you that parents have already phoned me and said "Will you get some information?" I now request the minister to send me some information on this concept and what the official thinking is on it. I don't want to have a discussion about it right at this time because it is getting pretty narrow.

My feeling, Mr. Chairman, and we've had this from the minister so often in this debate, is that his answer to any area of decision in education is let's try them all, because we really can't tell which one is good. You can't try everything in every community. There has to be somebody making some decision as to what will be a good thing for the community, for example, of St. George, Ont. I'm not convinced that the open concept is going to be a good thing. If the local board decides that it is, that is what we are going to have.

On the other hand a very healthy aspect of community life now is that the parents are not prepared to say, "Amen; the board said so; therefore we will do it." As a matter of fact, just the opposite is the case. The board can't possibly make a decision that the community is prepared to accept, either wholeheartedly or any other way. They may impose their decision. So when the minister gives us the idea in his answers that almost any alternative is equally good and the thing to do is try them all, I just don't think that that is right. We've come a long way from the other attitude which was fought in this Legislature, in the days of the minister's predecessor back in the early Fifties. Who was the gentleman from Eglinton?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Dr. Dunlop.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Dr. Dunlop made a real value of talking about the concept of back

to the little red schoolhouse. I'm sure, if the minister talked that way, there would be many people in this province who would just think he was the greatest thing since—well, Bill Davis. But he is not doing that. On the other hand, I just want to be careful that we follow the minister's own advice when he says we shouldn't get the idea that any concept contains all of the solutions; I would just tell him that the concept of trying everything everywhere isn't the solution either.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, that was very interesting, the Leader of the Opposition's reference to the little red schoolhouse. The only little red schoolhouse that I can remember is the one I used to buy on firecracker day to set off for my kids. But you can't even buy that now, because they don't seem to want people to have fireworks anymore.

I think what I was trying to stress is something that we've been trying to get into education. I am sure, to an even greater degree than I've ever done, his former education critic used to talk about involvement of the local people in the whole education process. What we are really saying is that nobody here in the Ministry of Education, least of all the minister, can say what is going to be the best learning situation, the best organization for that learning situation or the best architectural arrangements in which learning can take place. We can't really say that here. We can try to evaluate different systems; we can tell you what we found out and we can give you opinions on it.

What we are saying is our new thrust is to give a high degree of autonomy to the local boards, which now have the large diversity of resources to do these things and, then, let them in conjunction with the people they serve try to find out what is best. It may be that in certain situations the open concept class, or a special type of school like they have got in Toronto is the thing to do, because the people in that area want it, because there is a grassroots movement for it, or because there are teachers who are interested in it, who want to take part in some particular type of schooling or process. But because it works there doesn't mean it will work elsewhere; because it works in St. George doesn't mean it will work in Ontario county necessarily.

In the past, we have tended to look at things and, then, suddenly say we recommend this step to everybody. That is what we are trying to get away from. We are trying here in the ministry—and hopefully when we develop our evaluation process over the next few years we will be able to do this in a much better manner—to be able to assist the local boards and the local people by telling them what we've found out about things that have been tried in areas and, then, let them make up their own minds on whether they want to adopt this kind of step or not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that you can make it either black or white. The minister's concept of trying many different things in many different areas is obviously not to find out which one is best, because he is never going to make that determination. This minister will never make a determination. A certain thing is either best or even better than another; his determination is going to be to have it one way on the first floor and another way on the second floor. Fine, all right, but how does that serve the worried mothers of Brant county because the local director of education is a very busy person and he is going to make certain recommendations?

I think that at a minimum you should be able to give us a very specific comparison with comments from teachers and students and others on both sides. You just cannot have unending controversy in every community on every educational subject. It gets tiresome and there is a tendency to say "Let the board and the director decide."

It is not good enough that way and we are going to have to be provided with information. Since all of the rest of the leadership has been abdicated and you do nothing but review budgets evidently, maybe you had better start sending out some of this information. You don't have to underscore one side or the other or make any decision or anything like that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, in case I left the impression that we don't send this advice out, we certainly do. Indeed, here is part of one of the studies. As I say, we evaluate from many points of view and we publish this information. We make it known to the boards. We recommend things that they should be aware of if they are going into particular new arrangements.

This is a book that goes out called, "Open Space General Learning Facilities for Kindergarten, Primary and Junior Students." It has a lot of information which can help the board. It is our responsibility to encourage the boards to do this but it is their responsibility to do it and it rather bothers me

when I find examples where this hasn't been done.

When they want to change a system, when they want to close one-room schools and two-room schools, they don't seem to consult the people enough. These schools boards are elected by the people. They have to be re-elected. You know, in any kind of process today I think if you involve the people in the process, they see what you are doing. If you don't involve them in it and you suddenly say, or they hear by a newspaper or by gossip or something that this is going to happen, they immediately become very uptight about it.

I think this is the kind of thing that a local board has got to do. They have to go out and explain what they are trying to do, why they think that the open concept school is going to benefit the people of St. George. They have to talk to them about it. There is an elected trustee who is just as responsible to his people as you and I are to ours and it's his job to work with them. He represents them and that's what we encourage them to do.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What if he says make it open on the first floor and closed on the second? What are we going to do then?

Hon. Mr. Wells: All right, now I—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's the sort of problem we have at every level in education which is really driving some of the taxpayers crazy.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I used that example—and there may be something in this book; I haven't read it but there may be something in it—because I visited a senior public school, if you will forgive me for the personal reference, in the borough of Scarborough last Monday. I toured through it and this is exactly what I found. The second floor was the open concept; the third floor was regular classrooms.

That school was on a rotation system and for certain subjects and certain parts of the day, the students were in the open concept areas. For other things they were in the regular classrooms. I was told by the principal and the students and staff working there that for the setup they had in this school, it was working well. This school, interestingly enough, is a four-storey school building, which again is an unusual occurrence. Most schools are only two stories but because of land limitations, this is how they built this school.

Mr. Chairman: On item 1.

Mr. Foulds: On item 1, I want to touch on a couple of points that have been discussed already on this vote, earlier this morning. I want to make one quick comment on the matter which was been raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the minister. I firmly think that the mix which the minister is talking about in terms of architectural design is a healthy step forward. If I may be forgiven a personal reference, I was in an open concept school which, by and large, was working very well except that they had a tent set up right in the middle of one of the spaces. The reason they had the tent set up in the middle of this vast open space was because occasionally a couple of the children needed some privacy. They wanted some security, some walls around them. And you had two or three children quite happily inside the tent.

It seems to me that isn't something we should be alarmed about or should get upset about; it's not something that should cause us to say immediately that the open concept failed. All we are trying to say is that the open concept doesn't work all the time for all students, and occasionally the regular classroom may be the most learning situation for some students in relation to some curriculum matters.

I want to move on now to talk briefly about the matter that was raised so ably by my colleague from Parkdale. I just want to touch on it, because I think he went into it in enough detail.

I'm glad to see that the minister appears to have moved during these estimates from what appeared earlier to be a more hardened tradition in his discussion this morning. This has encouraged me.

I think one of the things that we in this party are concerned about, and the thing I wanted to talk about a little more fully, which we weren't able to do in the question period about a week or so ago, is that I can see the use of languages such as Italian, Portuguese and so on as a teaching device at the elementary level, and I can see that happening over more than a year. I can see it happening over a school programme.

When you have a young child who is not yet a student who has just figured out the conceptual difference between, say, the Italian *caldo* and *fredo* (hot and cold), and he gets into a school where he is only taught "hot" and "cold", he has to make another conceptual leap. It is very difficult for him to adjust to.

I don't think it's going to particularly undermine the integrity of our system if in the teaching process we can approach the concepts in the language in which the child is most familiar, particularly when there is a high concentration of that language. We should truly integrate the immigrant student into our system so that perhaps initially he learns primarily in his language and, as his facility with English and whatever other languages we are able to teach at that age becomes more familiar, we move into those. But I think there is a cultural and language shock that we should be very gentle with, it seems to me, when people from backgrounds other than English or French are moving into our educational system.

I want to move on now, too, to the unfortunate thing that happens to a number of students from immigrant backgrounds in some of the counselling that they get. This is tied to curricula.

I don't think we can deny the tendency on the part of many guidance people to advise students from immigrant backgrounds to take the vocational and commercial branches of our secondary school system, to opt for what we used to call the four-year programme, in a proportion of numbers that is unduly high. In many cases the guidance people do this, as I said earlier, with the best of intentions. In my reading for this I came across a clipping in which one guidance counsellor admitted doing this because he didn't want to unduly raise the expectations of the student or of his family. He wanted the student to avoid the heartbreak of meeting a lack of success in other areas.

That is very understandable. But I think the problem remains that it is unfair to some of those individuals whose potential we have not yet tapped. For example, those individuals who are not necessarily good manually, but because they continue to have the language difficulty, their academic ability has not yet been brought to the fore. Those individuals, it seems to me, are harmed.

I think it is also unfair to our society because, after all, we pride ourselves on the Canadian mosaic. We take a lot of satisfaction in the contribution made to our society by immigrants to our country; and yet we may channel immigrants into some of our educational programmes too early; programmes that may not necessarily meet their needs.

We are also failing our society because we are inhibiting those students from making as full a contribution to our society as they may be capable of; so that there is a two-way harm done here. I think that we have to constantly think, not only of the individual, but of the benefits to the society that we lose.

I want to take up an issue that really bothers me in this respect; and I think it is connected with curriculum and curriculum development. That is, the fact that the drop-out rate in Metro Toronto high schools is up somewhat. I believe the Globe and Mail reported 22 per cent at the end of April. A total of 9,213 drop-outs seems to me to be rather alarming. The article went on to discuss a number of possible reasons for this. There are more options open. Students don't look upon school as being necessarily the year-after-year experience, as we did; and they may drop back in again next year. This may not be an unhealthy thing, but I suspect a large number of the drop-out rate in a community such as Toronto may be due to people who are having language difficulties.

It seems to me that because of this, we have to begin to look at the alternatives that I talked about earlier; the combination of the work and schooling experience, perhaps. I would hope that the ministry would take an active interest in the experiment that, I believe, is being tried here in Toronto. It is called "Contact," and is a programme for drop-outs. It is patterned along the same lines as SEED, only it is for those people that have dropped out of the system, as I've said.

I think that we should not be satisfied with merely patting ourselves on the back because these experiments are taking place. I think we have to be really—as the minister indicated in terms of curriculum—reviewing these experiments. Those we find working with a certain type of student and a percentage of the school population, we must be prepared to expand. We must make full use of them to exploit the potential of our student body.

Mr. Chairman: Have you any comments, Mr. Minister?

Item 1 carried?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, on this curriculum aspect of education, I would like to say a few words on the Mackay report, and upon the general approach of the department to both moral and religious education.

As far as the Mackay report is concerned on the moral, not religious, issue, its recommendations are basically, I think, as follows: that there ought to be no specific or formal curriculum, that the moral aspect of life

should be taught to children as it arises in the course of discussion on any other subject which they might be considering at the time, and that anecdotal material could be introduced which would point up the conflicts, etc., some of that material being highly hilarious in some of its aspects. Can one ever read without laughing the thing about the Indian who carted the provisions across the ice for several hundred miles, starving to death, and arrived heroically at the Hudson's Bay post without having touched a fragment of the food? There is free enterprise for you. There is private property held sacrosanct at the highest ideal. What do you do with an educational system that would teach anyone to starve to death in order to protect the property of his employer, over against human life?

Mr. Foulds: You'll be glad to know that most of the students today think the guy is absolutely insane.

Mr. Lawlor: They do? Well, most of the students are on the way to socialism, if that is the case, and on the way to common sense, of course, in this particular regard.

I approve of the central core of the Mackay report, and I don't know why it is not advanced more centrally; that is, that Mackay, in the sciences and in mathematics for instance, is concerned with the process of reasoning, the reasons that go into a decision, and pointing out that there must be reasons and justifications for what we do in this life, that we don't do it spontaneously, by whim, as a result of instinct or desire off the cuff, but that we do it for good reasons, that we can tell people why we act as we act at any particular context. Then those reasons, of course, are subject to circumspection, to say, "Yes, how inadequate they are in the context. Are you not missing a whole different universe of principles that ought to apply? Have you thought of this?" Then people say, "No, I didn't." And that is the first step in education. When you say, "No, I didn't think of that," you are becoming educated.

Mackay is strong on practical reasoning, which is quite different from scientific reasoning on the other hand, which is of a deductive model basically, whereas the reasoning involved in moral matters is experimental, concrete, dealing with special circumstances, always pointing out the particular, and then applying it to a general principle.

There are some things wrong in this particular context with the Mackay report. One can't help but smile, gently may be, but smile nevertheless, at the insistence on the use of character and character moulding, the very terminology. I was going to bring with me this morning, and forgot to, that most wonderful "making fun of Dr. Arnold Rugby," done by Lytton Strachey in his "Eminent Victorians," where character was everything and intelligence was very little.

The whole English public system, revolving around the concepts back toward the third quarter of the last century, trying to get rid of the crabbed and pedantic and dreadful classificatory disciplines that had come through in the public sphere until that time, turned holus-bolus its intent into moulding something called "character," something which a more self-sufficient, arbitrary, obtuse type of human being, one cannot imagine. There, with a vengeance, as Dickens pointed out, a human being would emerge from the educational system despite, in the face of, in the teeth of, what was being taught in the schools.

A good deal of that persists today, not because they are moulding any character—thank heavens for that!—but because of the sloppiness, because there is no dedication to the sense of beauty. The concept of aspiration, albeit in individual terms has been watered down.

There are a lot of these things in which I find I have placed myself in the camp of the old haters, I'm afraid, in this particular regard, except, for me, I wouldn't set up universal objective standards that everybody would be required to meet, as Cardinal Newman did. Apart from that, there would be, nevertheless, our own personal concepts of excellence which would be fed, watered, and given protection.

That is partially because of the circumscribed curriculum that they had in the 19th century, whereas we have such a plethora of subjects that involves some degree of pluralism, some degree of personal initiative and affirmation as to which way we want to go without negating completely those things which we find unpalatable to ourselves, which are always a crucial part of our educational growth.

But, then, one is caught in a dilemma on the whole matter of moral education. When you go back to the chief educator of us all —the man universally recognized as possibly one of the wisest men who ever lived, certainly the greatest educator of them all, specifically as an educator—to Socrates, here is a man who never wrote a line. He despised books basically and didn't think very highly

of them and certainly didn't write anything down. He relied upon his pupil to do that. In fact, he wouldn't have relied; he would have told him to destroy it. He relied on the human word, the impact of the walking up and down that he did in the business of smoking at them, although they didn't smoke. That was an Indian invention that took place in his time.

His aim, and the aim, therefore, from the very initiation of any concept of education in the West and, overwhelmingly in terms of the East, was to shape human beings, to make good men. That is what he was trying to do. All the rest was a piece of apparatus directed toward that end.

You learned mathematics, so that you could see principles of universality and consistency and so that you could be consistently good and universally good. The whole arrangement of education was with that single purpose. That has not persisted in the West. If you read Aquinas, for instance, or coming down much later, a fellow like Kant, the chief aim would be intellectual development, and be damned with the formation of what Mackay calls character, the full development of the human personality.

Of recent years, there has been a tendency to swing back the old way. Part of this, through Piaget and others, has been the talk and the emphasis. Dewey had it and pretty well all progressive educators. They talk about the whole child and they mean the emotional development, the biological development, the business of physical training, the business of a good mind and a good body, the social development, the business of not being afraid of other people and not running away from them. In our civilization we tend to think shyness is a virtue, when it only means a self-feeding and a form of egotism, which is not good for the full development of the human being.

So that emphasis has come back. As a result of that emphasis coming back in the last 20 years, a reorientation again is taking place as to where to fit morality into the curriculum. How does it work? Norman Mackay takes the easy line, let's put it that way, the non-Socratic line in this regard. He says it is a question of understanding. It is a question of understanding the moral stances of others, their positions, their doctrines, and being able to criticize them and to trade back and forth.

Is understanding enough? That has become the question. We can understand a great deal and admire it, but do just the opposite. Is the educational system designed in any way to so nourish the plant so that the tree will grow straight, and will not do just the opposite? Is it possible within the context—Mackay scouts that but it's a central issue as far as I can see—and that's why you get the watered down, rather bland gruel that he serves out in terms of information rather than commitment as he calls it. He finds the distinction between indoctrination and learning—but it's not all that neat and you can't divide things up in the neat pigeonholes as that particular report, under the moral head, seeks to do.

In other words, there's a whole tradition in the west—Bonaventure had it; it comes down through Pascal—that you can't be intelligent without being good. Your orientation to reality, the way things come at you and the way in which you accept them with the kind of grace that you have; the way you're able to absorb the torturous, the unpalatable, the things that are terriffic in this life, the general deportment of mind is a moral position and nothing to do with your intelligence. But having that position, it is the springboard or the flowering grounds upon which the flowers of intelligence may grow.

The opposite tradition is the emphasis upon knowing and not caring so much about doing. That may flow from it.

At least the tradition of the Mackay report would say "that if you have that basic understanding and qualification, you're not obtuse or ignorant of an alternative position which may be presented to you." Half the evils in this world are committed by people, so they would argue, through sheer ignorance, through not knowing of other possible routes of action and ways of approaching things. There's a great deal of truth to that.

I suppose as we come into a fuller idea of what education really is—and we're really quite pygmy in our approaches at this time in our civilization—I wouldn't be standing here talking about these ambiguities, in a kind of a blind attempt to sort them out a little bit in the process, if we weren't at such a primitive stage of understanding.

The work that Dr Beck is doing deserves the highest commendation. There is not enough emphasis upon it. There is not enough discussion about it. He seems to me to lead a fairly solitary existence writing these reports in vacuo somehow. Meanwhile the Province of Ontario marks time, not itself being afflicted by meandering doubts as to what direction it ought to go.

It's the Conservative mentality as evidenced by Mr. George Drew, for instance, in 1944 when he, after deliberation, brought a focusing of religious education into the schools. The temper of mind there says, "Somehow or other, we don't know quite how, the moral values, the integrity, the honesty, the courage that people may have in forfending in this life is based upon or somehow has reference to spiritual values or values behind it of some kind."

They're religious values, if you will, and one won't exist without the other. Therefore, we must be the proponents—this is the Conservative position—of some kind of religious values, however amorphous, in the schools. We intend that this should be so. While we're going to move in on sections 41 and the rest of the sections under the Education Act in a short time—and I welcome him to do that; it will be a marvellous debate to see what he really comes with at the end of that time—the end-product of that, if you investigate it and it's caught again in the Mackay report, is to so water down and render meaningless any religiosity, anything that religion may have anything whatsoever to do with, so far as people who are religious are concerned. That is, the sense of commitment, the sense of heightened vitality, the sense of forfending, the sense of tragedy in life, the deep profound, moving things.

You can't water that down and still call it religion. That's the problem you're facing in the schools. To be on the side of angels and yet foppish in the process—milkweed and the drips of honey in the educational system—is defeating your purpose. You make a gesture toward that and your gesture falls flat.

For instance, one of the things—and I quite agree with it—is the Roman Catholic ecumenical commission. I can't put my hands on their report at the moment, but it does say you certainly can't have it in the religious sphere, in the religious education that Mackay talks about. You can't have it permeating the curriculum in the same way as the moral thing is supposed to do. It should be a set subject matter to give concentration to it; to give it a focus and a meaning.

As a matter of fact, what this report says seems to me to have a great deal of vitality. The 15th recommendation says, and this is from the ecumenical study commission on religious education:

> The course we are now recommending would obviously be radically different from what the province has had for the last 25 years.
>
> First, it would genuinely be a course in religion, rather than one particular religion, namely Christianity.

They go off on two or three western religions: Judaism, Christianity and secular humanism

And you know, they are quite right to include secular humanism in the context. For one who has ever spent any time at all reading Bertrand Russell, there is his marvellous essay on the "Bold Man's Religion," or something like that. The thing is eloquent, it appeals, it jettisons any after-life. It says we have to face up to the life we have in front of us right now. We mustn't seek comfort or extraterritorial satisfactions of the balm of Gilead, or anything like that, in order to salve our wounds. We take life as it is in all its ferocity. It is a heroic and ideal position that Russell took on the thing.

So, you may speak of religion as Mackay does, and as I am doing now, and as George Grant likes to do usually; in the very broadest sense as meaning anything in a man's life that is ultimate; that upon which his life finally hangs; the things that he won't do no matter what; or the things that move him in relation to death, to estrangement, to isolation; the ultimate meaning and existence, whatever it may be for a man; is religious in its demarcations.

The second thing is they say is to offer a wide course. They don't go off at this particular time into the area of the world religions, which I will say a few words about before I sit down today, or maybe next Thursday.

The course would be topped by certified specialists in religious studies on the regular full time staff of the school, rather than by untrained instructors coming in on a casual basis from the outside. I think that is wise and to the point. I think since the amalgamation into the university system, it has to be done by people, trained in anthropology, in comparative religions, and having backgrounds of that kind in a formal way.

Thirdly, it would be a subject taken for credit; just like geography or history.

Fourth, it would prepare the interested pupil to continue with the study of the subject if he goes on to university.

Those basic nostrums seem completely in line with the best interests of religious education in the schools.

Now I just wanted to mention a fairly obvious thing. If you go to the basic Aristotelian tradition and say that intellectual training is the sole end of education and that the other things will perhaps, and perhaps not, flow from it; that you either haven't got time to try to develop full human beings, because that pretty well takes a lifetime—even if you set them on the right course, or courses—because there isn't any one course as I see it, to achieve this end; that you can make very sharp intelligences, that you can develop peoples' power of acquisition or comprehension and their skills in articulation to a very high degree at a very early stage.

But to try to do that in schools to the amplitude of their moral life is a bit beyond the competence. If you take that position, then nevertheless they are surrounded; one recognizes that written indirectly right into the process of learning is an enormous amount of moral factors and necessities.

How can you become a scholar or even comprehend a small area of reality, or even be able to speak well in this House, or do anything in life that is of any value if you haven't got at least a modicum of perseverance, that kind of patience and persistency which we all somehow feel is being eroded.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is perseverance supposed to be in the speaker or the listener?

Mr. Lawlor: Pardon?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the perseverance supposed to be in the speaker or the listener?

Mr. Lawlor: I can't hear you.

Mr. Worton: It all depends whether you are coming or going.

Mr. Lawlor: Going beyond that, I was going to say on the business of persistency, the kids—yes, I practise it myself on occasion.

Mr. Foulds: Persistence without insistence.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, I think half an hour out of all these estimates, particularly at the latter end of a dreary day, won't hurt anybody.

We feel—at least I do—that a certain flabbiness has grown into that, particularly in terms of the proposed curriculum and the proposed measures for education. It seems to me that whatever the area, however much accord you give to areas of self-determination and personal interest in education—and I think it's crucial that personal interest be exercised, otherwise the desire to learn is not there, or is killed if there's enforcement. At the same time, it must operate within some kind of structure.

It can't be expected that the kinds of moral things be written into the learning processes, such as a modicum of self-discipline—to be able to sit down with the seat of your pants to the back of the chair and spend a few hours at it. That cannot be relied upon to proceed out of the interest as such; human frailty is such that we become dislocated, we are distracted by distraction after distraction. We simply don't do that. It has to be taught. We have to train ourselves. And it's a thing that quickly disappears.

There's the haphazard life of this House, for instance, and the total superficiality that reigns. We deal with the ad hoc matters of the moment, and like gadflies they flit out the window in a manner which had us all strung up and turned into corkscrews the day before yesterday, but we can't even remember what they were.

Just to be moral, there must be something just a little bit longer than the disappearing or the transient. I don't know if these things, as in the old days of morality, could be called absolutes and everlasting values; I just don't think that's so any more. But at least it has a certain life, a certain kind of inbuilt permanence beyond yesterday and therefore that gives us the guiding norms. And the same thing is worked into the process of learning.

Well, it had been my intention, Mr. Chairman, to speak for some time and to run through what is encompassed in the concept of morality and moral teaching in schools. I have before me a lengthy—

Mr. Stokes: Go ahead,

Mr. Lawlor: No, I would like to mention an experiment that is being done out my way—out in Etobicoke, I believe—by a man by the name of Douglas M. Parker in the Sea School.

By the way, I just got a notation in this morning's mail that my two children are not going to be admitted into Sea School. I wanted them to become highly creative, dancing intellectual sprites like their old man, and to get them into this school away from the enclosing walls and the claustrophobic contents and all that sort of thing.

But the letter came and they are way down on the list. I won't attribute motives, I won't say why. It is nothing to do with me, of

course. Having got a telephone call some weeks ago saying "please apply" and then at the end of the day having built up a certain enthusiasm in this regard, one is stoic toward life—and that's another moral stance. You say it will probably all work out for the best.

One of the things they are doing at that school under the auspices of Parker is trying to draw up a curriculum. I believe the department has not given formal or any kind of approval to this; that it is still tentative. I would like to know from the minister in due course just what they are doing in the area of the world religions.

The concept of the course given at this school is designed to develop a sympathetic understanding of the world's major religions. In the course of doing that a visitation to one of about 15 churches mentioned here has to take place; certain seminar work has to be done; two essays must be done. There is a series of these seminars at which papers are given, Shintoism for instance. They make a distinction between Judaism/Jeremiah and Judaism/Moses—what that is I am not quite sure—and Zen Buddhism and Zoroastrianism, all of which are going to be studied.

I see the Roman Catholic faith gets two periods and the protestants only one; there is another period on the Islamic faith. Besides that they go into Wordsworth and a number of other people such as Prudhomme as an integral part of the whole religious exercise. Again, I am convinced that is the only way in which to make that approach but I would like the minister's comments upon the concept being set forth here. The paper in this regard is in a publication called Ontario Education and was written basically by Hugh Griggs, a person well known to a good many of us in the west end of Toronto.

I would like to know whether the minister regards this particular setup as a good pilot project? Would he go further and think that it might be some utility in the wider area of education in Ontario, in other schools? What emendations might he make to the curriculum as laid out and as set out here and, really, whether it has, in his mind, must merit at all.

Mr. Chairman: If I may interrupt the hon. member for Lakeshore, would this be a convenient time to break off?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I thought perhaps it might be fitting as the benediction for the day to quote from the ancient writer of Proverbs who, I think, said something like "Get knowledge, get understanding, but with all thy getting, get wisdom" and then he takes the rest of the book to try to explain how. I guess that is the question of the ages—how do you do this? We all try in our small way to provide our answer and probably thousands of years from now they will still be asking how.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 1 carried?

Carried.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer of Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House I wish now to place the motion that I moved earlier and withdrew so that there would be no contention in that regard today. I would like to move it now so that the committee stands referred to next week.

It is necessary because the business before the resources development committee will be moved to the social development committee. Accordingly, I move—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. minister would wait, if I might request him, to get permission of the House. Do I have permission of the House to revert to motions for this particular purpose?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the estimates of the Ministry of Labour stand referred to the social development committee in lieu of the resources development committee as previously ordered.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, does that mean that we are going to undertake an examination of the Labour estimates on Monday or will we be continuing with Community and Social Services?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I wouldn't like to say at this particular moment. I imagine that we'll continue Community and Social Services.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Further, on that—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll make that a commitment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On that motion, is the minister aware that the staffs of both the Department of Labour and the Department of Community and Social Services attended the committee room this morning? They were both there and no committee work at all was undertaken.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think the hon. member will know that there was a misunderstanding. I was of the opinion yesterday that it had been agreed that the change had taken place because of the commitment of the minister to attend another function. I regret that communication wasn't understood by all concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: On Monday we will return to the consideration in the House of the estimates of the Ministry of Education.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 2, 1972

Real estate industry regulations, statement by Mr. Winkler. 3123

Egg industry marketing conditions, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3124

Credit card entry to Ontario Place, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 3125

Dwelling insurance increase, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Lewis 3126

Pets in OHC projects, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis 3126

Pro-Con Consolidated Warehousing, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Bounsall 3127

Weekend parking for public at Department of Labour lots, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Givens 3127

Purchase of US goods, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Dukszta 3127

Professional fund-raising, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. MacDonald 3127

Lake Ontario Cement Ltd., questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Burr 3128

Alleged delay in preparing bills, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Shulman 3128

Spadina rapid transit, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Givens 3129

Ontario Securities Commission disclosure policy, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. MacDonald 3130

Effects of DISC legislation, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. B. Newman 3130

Dismissal of director of ROM, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer 3130

Environmental conference in Stockholm, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3133

OHC grants for low rental housing, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Bounsall 3133

Moosonee education centre, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Deacon 3133

Removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward county, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Burr, Mr. Lewis 3134

Metro civic dispute, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Givens 3135

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, continued 3136

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 3157

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 80

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, June 5, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1972

The House met today at 2:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: There are many visitors with us today. I would particularly like to mention that in the Speaker's gallery we have with us the Hon. A. W. Knight, member of the Parliament of Victoria, Commonwealth of Australia, representing his Parliament in the investigation of matters relating to pollution control, the steel industry, power generation and natural gas use.

We are also pleased to have visitors with us in the east gallery, students from Fern Avenue School of Toronto; and in both galleries from Richard W. Scott Separate School of Toronto. At 3:00 o'clock, in both galleries, we will have students from the Moira Secondary School of Belleville.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): When is the government going to arrive?

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

An hon. member: There is one minister here!

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would ask you, sir, to use your good offices with the members of the administration to ask them, as only perhaps you can, if they would arrange their responsibilities so that at least a few of them, at least a handful of them, could come into the House when we open after prayers so that matters of some urgent public importance can be asked and put forward in the question period. I wonder if you would undertake to do that for us, sir.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, for a government which has had many lows in its career, today is surely the nadir. No reflection on the House leader whose competence doubtless encompasses all his colleagues' portfolios, but we would wish that on occasion they could be brought out of the cabinet board rooms in time for question period. This is absurd; in fact you should suspend the question period, Mr. Speaker, if that is possible, until such time as the ministers are here.

Mr. Speaker: I must say, firstly, that of course I cannot accept the remarks as a point of order. Nothing is out of order.

An hon. member: Oh no!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Well Mr. Speaker, there is nothing here to be out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member could point out the order in the standing orders that says something is now out of order.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Ministerial responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot accept it as a point of order but I will of course, convey the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party to the proper quarter.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Could you postpone the question period?

Mr. Lewis: May I make a motion, sir?

Mr. Speaker: No, we haven't entered upon the order calling for motions.

I have been informed that the clock perhaps is slightly fast but if the question period is called, as the first order of business—I note that there are some members arriving—perhaps if I do exactly just that there may be some hon. members of the cabinet who will appear. I am sorry I cannot accept a motion during the question period. I think we must proceed with the question period.

Mr. Lewis: But you are doing a nice stall routine. I'll grant you that.

ATTENDANCE OF MINISTERS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier who has now come in at the urging of the whip, who has been

out desperately searching the halls for somebody.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): I went for a drink of water.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Guess who he came up with? The longest drink of water from Brampton.

I would like to ask the Premier if he will confer with his cabinet colleagues and urge them once again to attend the House during question period, if not for prayers; tell them that it is part of their democratic responsibility, for which I presume they are adequately paid, to attend the question period in some reasonable numbers from time to time? Would the Premier undertake to do that?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to do so.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Globe and Mail can't do it every week.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't know if the question of adequacy of honorarium is relevant to attendance here in the House. Quite obviously, it is the responsibility—

Mr. Stokes: Attached to it is a certain responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite right; no question about that, Mr. Speaker.

A number of my colleagues will be here very shortly. There have been one or two matters of rather pressing public interest. I expect several of them will be here very shortly.

COMPLAINTS FROM INDIANS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Can he explain to the House why, as a result of this weekend's conference of—the Premier doesn't like to call them ethnic peoples—peoples from various backgrounds in the Province of Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't care what the Leader of the Opposition calls anyone. I just expressed my own personal point of view. What he wishes to call anybody is without question his own business.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sometimes what I call people is not in order either, or even parliamentary.

Can the minister explain why Indians in the northwestern part of the province have been complaining about the terms of their employment as firefighters? Secondly, why two Indian chiefs, I believe from his own riding, have indicated publicly that they got nothing out of the conference and didn't have an opportunity to contribute?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I can reply to one part of the question. I think the hon. member will realize that I am not in a position to comment on the second part, because it was a newspaper report and I have not had the opportunity of speaking with the chiefs in question.

I might say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I spent the weekend in northwestern Ontario visiting such areas as Red Lake, Sandy Lake and North Spirit Lake. To come back this morning—I arrived about an hour ago—and to read an article in the paper about the Indians being disgruntled with the Ministry of Natural Resources came as a complete surprise. All I received up there were compliments on how they were treated and the work that they are doing with my particular department.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That's all the minister ever hears.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I had the matter checked out with regard to some of the statements. Our regular rate is $1.90 an hour, as I had pointed out to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier) during the estimates. The experienced firefighter gets $2.35 an hour and the foremen get $2.75 an hour.

At the particular fire in question there were 30 Indians involved; only two of those Indians were receiving $1.90 an hour. Most of them were receiving $2.35 and Mr. Buddy Salt, the one, I believe, who was interviewed, received $2.75 an hour as he was the foreman on that particular job. If there is anything further the member would like to ask I could—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister give any reasonable explanation why, although the Indians who spoke to him personally seemed to be delighted with their treatment, still the chiefs of the bands are critical of government policy in this regard and have expressed their criticism, in a different way, at the conference that has just concluded over the weekend?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the chiefs' impression deals with the federal government, because these are federally governed reserves. I might say—and I'm sure that the member for Thunder Bay will

agree with me—when the chiefs do comment they say that the Ontario government is moving into the field and is doing all it can from their point of view. I think this is one of the comments that they did make at the conference last year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By way of supplementary, is the minister aware that Chiefs Fiddler and Chapman were specifically critical of the organization of the provincial conference, which according to them gave them no opportunity to express their views? I believe they were quoted as saying that they got nothing out of it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I have no comment to make on that. I would like the opportunity to speak with both of those chiefs. I'm sure once I did, that the impression might be somewhat different.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is there any validity in the claim a person made in the same article that while native people were getting $1.90 an hour for Saturday and Sunday work, members of the minister's own regular staff were getting $9 an hour? Is there any validity in the claim that the accommodation offered native people was much inferior to that given to the minister's regular firefighting force?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, it is possible for a resource technician 3 to get two and a half times his hourly rate when working on a statutory holiday. That would put him fairly close to the $9 rate.

Under the regulations for firefighters, there is no overtime paid. In other words, they work 20 or 25 hours or whatever they want, and they still get the regular rate of pay, because of being casual help. This is the reason. I would point out that the supervisory staff within the ministry does not get paid any overtime at all. But a resource technician 3, engaged in firefighting or that particular work on a statutory holiday, could conceivably receive that much.

Mr. Stokes: What's the difference in the accommodation though between the minister's casual work force and his regular work force? It was a part of the contention, that the accommodation for native people was much inferior to that given to the department's regular firefighting forces.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As I understand it, the supervisory help and the work force—the firefighters—have the same accommodations when they're on a fire. They use tents, and it's basically the same type of accommodation.

Certainly, when they're in camp, when they're at a base, there could be some difference; as in Sioux Lookout, where the base personnel have their own homes and have their regular bunkhouses to go to. The firefighters who are standing by have very comfortable other accommodation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader for the Opposition.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Are we to assume that the two pieces of regional government legislation that were predicted in the Speech from the Throne will be coming into the House in the next few days so that we can have some reasonable opportunity to examine them before we have to debate second reading?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, the presumption of the Leader of the Opposition is quite accurate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Treasurer, who has just taken his place, on the same subject. Can he explain why he has been releasing certain pieces of information associated with the regional government bills in the areas to be affected, such as the date of the election for the regional government and the decision of the government to excise about 35 to 40 per cent of Beverly township and put it in with the new region before the provisions of the bill are known.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I regret that the provisions of the bill aren't known. Normally, the bill would have been introduced and that sort of information would have been contained in it. I think, normally, it might have been brought in and then stayed on the order paper for some time, with changes made as a result of the ongoing public discussion. We have had, as the Leader of the Opposition is no doubt aware, some drafting problems in terms of ministerial legal advice in the office of the legislative counsel. Unfortunately, in a number of areas things are coming out this way, which I regret; but I don't know the solution to the problem.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Does the minister envisage the same situation that

we experienced some years ago when the Niagara legislation was introduced, I believe on a Thursday, and the government went ahead with second reading the following Tuesday, with two days in which the municipalities concerned had an opportunity to examine the legislation; which I thought, for one—and I think the minister would agree—was inadequate?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that those of us on this side of the House—and I am sure I speak for my colleagues—are prepared to stay here as long as is necessary to do the business which we feel is necessary for the orderly discharge of the affairs of our responsibilities; and will do so. If the Leader of the Opposition, of course, is anxious to get away for July and August, we will do our best to accommodate him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Wouldn't the Treasurer agree that part of doing his best would be to get these important pieces of legislation, which have been long predicted, before the House sometime before the second or third week in June?

Can the minister explain why, in fact, all of the, let's say operative dates of the legislation have already been imparted—in fact, I suppose, imposed upon the people who are going to have to respond to them—before anything has been said here in the House? And why is it when the minister was questioned by one of the hon. members to my left he refused to answer the questions at all? He simply says that they were, what; provocative I believe—

Mr. Lewis: He doesn't answer our questions; he only answers the little questions.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I've already explained some of the drafting difficulties which we've encountered; and I think that's the answer to the question, much as I might regret it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, well, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, on a matter very close to home; will the minister tell me if, in fact, the upper concessions of the township of South Dumfries are going to be placed in with the regional area of Waterloo, as was also recommended by Fyfe?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think I can assure the hon. member that that will not happen, and that his position in Brant county will remain inviolate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, I would just question him further by saying: Doesn't he realize that whatever he does, my position in Brant county gets stronger?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: One can only regret, Mr Speaker—I am not sure whether I am answering questions; it seems to me that we may—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —have degenerated into a bit of a commentary. But since you've let it go on this long, sir, I can only say that I regret my friend's position in the Liberal Party wasn't as strong as his position in Brant county.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R F. Nixon: I'm quite satisfied.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The hon. member walked into that one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

An hon member: Why, the minister couldn't even get his goons to applaud it.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Scarborough West.

DISMISSAL OF DIRECTOR OF ROM

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities: Can he indicate to the House under what section of the Act, or regulations, of the Royal Museum of Ontario Act, that Dr. Peter Swann was fired?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, the Act is quite broad and the board of trustees has pretty well complete and autonomous power to operate the museum. Section 5, for example: "The board has all the powers necessary, or convenient, to achieve the objects of the museum; and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may" . . . and then there are a series of subsections, one of which indicates that it may appoint a director of the museum. Another one, subsection (d): "Fix the duties, salaries and qualifications of office, or employment of the director . . . provide for retirement and superannuation for various people."

I would assume that the powers there, coupled with the powers, of course, to make bylaws, rules and regulations, would give it the powers that it has exercised in the last few days.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Is the minister not assuming perhaps a bit much? Is it not, perhaps, likely that by way of technicality, or otherwise, the same section which gives the power to appoint a director of the museum, precisely excludes the power to remove the director of the museum; while making that power of removal applicable to associate directors, or curators, or other offices? And would the minister not think that that may give him an opportunity to sit down with the board yet again, and discuss with them the appropriateness of its action?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well Mr. Speaker, all I would say is that if, under the provisions of the Act and the powers of the board, it has done something that it has not the power to do, I would certainly do as the hon. member suggests.

Mr Lewis: May I—sorry, is that a supplementary?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Supplementary, yes!

Is the minister able to tell the House the reason Dr. Swann was fired; bearing in mind that $4 million of public money is voted to the Royal Ontario Museum by this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it would be repeating some of the things that I have already said in the House and some of the things that were said by the chairman of the ROM at a press conference last week. It is difficult, I am sure the hon. members realize, to give any specific reason or to pinpoint any particular reason why the director was dismissed.

To review very briefly: Just a week ago there was a motion passed by the board that Dr. Swann's contract would not be renewed. The sequence of events hasn't been reported correctly The first meeting was strictly to deal with whether or not the contract, which was to expire at the end of this year, would be renewed. This meeting, of course, was a result of a request by Dr. Swann. It was only at a later meeting, on the Wednesday, that the board gave Dr. Swann the option either to resign or be dismissed, and then that was done on Thursday.

I have indicated to the House that my information was that there were troubles with the staff, particularly with a number of curators. Information was also given to me that there might be a number of resignations by staff members if Dr. Swann's contract was renewed. There have been troubles with the board for a number of months now, and I think that probably is the reason Dr. Swann's request for a five-year contract last year was not complied with and he was given a contract for something more than a year, with substantial termination pay.

I think the only possible way we can get to the bottom of this would be for the staff themselves to be agreeable to give information—

Mr. Singer: But the staff didn't fire, the board fired.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, the staff didn't fire, but the staff has assisted, certainly, in precipitating what has happened. And now for the staff to sit back and say—

Mr. Lewis: Give us the details! How can the minister say that?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —that it wants nothing to do with this doesn't seem to make sense under the circumstances.

Mr. Lewis: What were they?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: But it is a series of events that has caused this decision to be made; I think mainly it is probably some of Dr. Swann's methods—

Mr. Lewis: Which methods?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and certain controversies in dealing with staff members and board members.

Mr. Lewis: What controversies?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If the hon. members feel there should be a full-scale inquiry, that is their prerogative; but it is difficult, really, to say there is one particular reason that precipitated this, when we realize that the whole thing came about as a result of a request by Dr. Swann.

It is quite possible, Mr. Speaker, that what happened last week would not have taken place at this time if Dr. Swann had not requested the meeting that was held a week ago.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, in view of the fact that this

matter not only involves substantial public interest but substantial public moneys, wouldn't the minister agree, particularly by reason of the fact that he is unable to give us any explanation, that a full public inquiry should take place before the committee on human resources so that the public and the members of the Legislature could find out exactly what happened?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is the way to do it!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I would have to discuss a proposal like this with my colleagues in the cabinet. This will have to be, I suggest, a government decision.

Mr. Singer: By way of a final supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: That is a reasonable number of supplementaries.

The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I have another question, Mr. Speaker, on the same subject.

The minister will know that under section 15 of the Act he is specifically authorized to require a report from the board on such matters. Has he such a report and can he give it to the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I have asked for such a report. I haven't got a complete report at this time but I have requested it. Unfortunately, the chairman of the board—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, happened to leave town as soon as he fired Dr. Swann.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Has left for—

Mr. Lewis: South Africa.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —has left for a period of about one month.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, that's one of those convenient things.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I understand this particular trip had been laid on for some time.

Mr. Lewis: I am sure.

Mr. Singer: Let's ask Les. We'll bring him in and let's ask him.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If you'll let me finish, this is one of the reasons why there is a delay in my receiving the type of detailed report I want at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary to that question—

Mr. Speaker: That was really a supplementary—

Mr. Singer: It was a new question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There will be no more questions in that connection.

The hon. member for Scarborough West.

U OF T GOVERNING COUNCIL

Mr. Lewis: A question for the Minister of Colleges and Universities, on a related institution but not that one, Mr. Speaker: May I ask the Minister of Colleges and Universities, is it right that that he will soon be announcing, or the Premier will soon be announcing, the appointments of the Lieutenant Governor in Council to the governing council of the University of Toronto, which appointments will include, in the broad community representation, the chairman of Harding Carpets Ltd., the senior accountant with Price Waterhouse, the president of the Sun, the vice-president of Southam Press and commodore of the Royal Canadian Yacht Club, the vice-president of Noranda, the president of Superior Optical, the chairman of Koffler Drugs, the vice-president of Prudential, the vice-president of Allendale Insurance and the chairman of Imperial Oil? Is this what the minister meant by his new sense of community representation in these governing institutions?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: In answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that an announcement will be made sometime this week as to the new members of the University of Toronto governing council. I would suggest that the list that the hon. member has read, and which he no doubt obtained from Saturday's newspaper, is not entirely correct.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, it's not? I know there are additions which I have not yet put on the record. I would like to know who the community representatives are, though, that I haven't mentioned.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member will know when they are made.

Mr. Lewis: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: When the announcement is made the member will know.

Mr. Lewis: When the announcement is made; okay!

VOTE ON FRESHWATER FISH MARKETING

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Natural Resources? Why is he refusing to allow the Indian people of northwestern Ontario to hold an important meeting prior to the vote on the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corp.?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member brought this up. It has been a matter of deep concern to me. As you know, some time ago, I believe on Feb. 25, I announced the formation of a special advisory committee that would investigate the commercial fishing aspect in northwest Ontario as it pertains to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corp. situated in Winnipeg. At that time I said that this vote would be held by March 31, 1972.

It was proceeding quite well when the chairman of the committee contacted me and asked for an extension. I provided this extension for him, up to May 5 I believe. Then I was approached by one Billy Sault who met with me in my office. He asked for a further extension on the eve of the day that the vote was to be issued. I contacted the chairman in view of their request and suggested that he hold up the vote for a further week, until I had some confirmation as to the holding of a meeting with the Indian people. In fact, I even offered Mr. Sault the use of government aircraft to bring the Indians from Sioux Lookout for a meeting.

We did not hear from him for a week. We contacted him and gave him our telephone number. I was going to be in Kenora that week. We waited. We tried to contact him. He was in Kenora, and he was in Toronto, and failed to contact us. I might say that I was receiving a tremendous amount of pressure from the commercial fishermen throughout all of northwest Ontario, anxious to get on with the vote.

Because of the pressure, I advised Mr. Sault by telegram that in view of the pressure and the lateness of the season, I felt it was imperative to get on with the vote. I also told him that if he still has time and he wishes to go ahead with his meeting that we would certainly listen to the results of the meeting, because the government, of course, will make a decision after the vote is handed down.

Mr. Stokes: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister not been advised by members of his staff that Mr. William Sault, vice-president of the Union of Ontario Indians, had attempted to get in touch with the minister, and when he couldn't he had to go over to Ottawa? As a result he didn't get a return call from Mr. Sault.

I would like to know, further, why the minister is being so hidebound about the manner in which this vote is being taken, when the minister knows that the spring breakup makes it impossible for many of the commercial fishermen from northern reserves to come down until the spring breakup has been effected?

The third part of my question is about the vote itself, where you are only giving 25 Indian people, who are forced to operate on one band licence, one vote; while you are giving other white commercial fishermen one vote per licence. Is this not unfair and discriminatory against the native people?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear to the chairman that we would not discriminate in any way against the native Indian people of northwestern Ontario, because commercial fishing is their livelihood. But I want to make it a point—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, well the minister shouldn't be!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —that no call came to my office and I make myself as available as I possibly can. I told William Sault that I have an open-door policy. In fact he arrived in my office without an appointment of any kind and I was pleased to see him. I left him my telephone number and in no way did he try to get back to me, to my knowledge.

The other aspect, about the matter of one licence one vote; I brought this to the attention of the chairman of the committee and he has assured me that the votes will be colour-coded, the licence number will be on the ballot and it will be colour-coded so that he will know when the votes come in—and the votes are being handled by an auditor in Kenora. They will be listed so that we will know the feeling of the Indian people; regardless if there are 50 votes or 25 votes we will know the exact feeling of those Indian commercial fishermen.

What was the other point?

Mr. Stokes: The other point is, whether he is not aware of the spring breakup?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh yes.

Mr. Stokes: He has a meeting scheduled for the third week in June and he was asking postponement of the vote until all of the native people could convene to decide on which way they wanted to vote, whether to be in or out of the marketing corporation.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The dates were picked by the chairman of the committee, who is Mr. E. L. Carter, the former mayor of that community; and in setting those dates he was in constant touch with the members of my ministry. I think Mr. Olson is the one who is acting as the secretary of the committee, and it was through his knowledge and his assistance and his contact with the various people in the north that they struck these dates. They advised me and they assured that those dates would fit in with the breakup time and there would be no problem.

Mr. Lewis: Last supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Doesn't the minister recognize that for the sake of a 12-day delay he could win from the Indian fishermen involved in northwestern Ontario the recognition that he had tried particularly to accommodate their very critical needs on the matter of commercial fishing; and couldn't he provide for that delay which would allow their meeting to precede the vote?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I did stretch the time of the vote, because the original deadline was March 31—

Mr. Lewis: But it is their livelihood that is at stake!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and that has gone on now until the end of June. We are going into a fishing season. Their feelings will be considered; I have assured them of that to the nth degree.

Mr. Lewis: For the sake of 10 days the minister denies it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

EMPRISE CORP. ACTIVITIES

Mr. Lewis: Last question, Mr. Speaker, of the Solicitor General: In view of the fact that the Ontario Jockey Club has now removed Emprise Corp. as concessionaires in its various fields, will the Solicitor General examine Emprise's activities in other parts of Ontario, in other areas of Ontario's economy?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, my answer to the leader of the NDP is the same as the answer I gave to the member for High Park. I do not believe that it is in the public interest to relate to this House the course of investigation carried on by the responsible authorities in the total field.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister think it is in the public interest to allow Emprise to continue to be active in racetracks in this province which are not controlled by the Ontario Jockey Club?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of on what basis the agreement between the Ontario Jockey Club and—the hon. members keep using the term Emprise—

Mr. Shulman: Dominion Sports Service!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —Dominion Sportservice was terminated. There could be any number of reasons for that termination; the fact that the hon. member saw fit to give publicity to the implications relating to the corporation may have been one of the factors, I do not know, but I take the position as Solicitor General that it is not in the public interest to disclose the type of investigation or the scope of investigation being carried on by the relevant authorities.

Mr. Shulman: May I ask the minister if he is going to answer my question? Does he believe it's in the public interest to allow Emprise, or Dominion Sportservice if he prefers, to continue to be active on race tracks in this province?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, it is not my responsibility to pass judgement or a personal opinion any more than I am qualified to pass whether the hon. member is fit to practise medicine in the province. That is outside of my realm.

Mr. Shulman: The minister is not the Minister of Health; he is supposed to be the Solicitor General.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions? If not, the hon. member for Downsview had a question.

TORONTO GARBAGE STRIKE

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Could the Minister of Labour please tell

us what, if anything, he is going to do about the latest Metropolitan Toronto garbage strike. Surely we have had enough and surely we can expect something from this government to save Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where did the hon. member get that "had enough" phrase?

Mr. Singer: I thought of it.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Downsview, I must admit that I came in fairly late today. I came into Toronto shortly before 2 o'clock and I didn't have a chance to contact my department. However, I am told that this matter now is, of course, an internal grievance situation which can follow the normal grievance practice as laid out in the collective agreement. As I say, this is not of my own knowledge; I have to get in touch with my department later on today.

Mr. Singer: Well by way of supplementary, while it is true that the apparent cause is an internal grievance, the fact is that several hundred men have stopped doing their work —have withdrawn their services—and the people of Toronto look to the minister for some relief. What is the minister going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: One sure thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister is not going to shirk his responsibility.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that is good.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

ITALIAN STUDIES AT U of T

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): A question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities: What is the minister doing to assist the effort being made by the members of the Italian community to set up a separate course of Italian studies at the University of Toronto, around which the community could build and improve itself?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I have had requests regarding the possibility of an Italian language faculty, separate and apart from the joint faculty that exists with Hispanic studies at the present time.

As the hon. member appreciates, this is a university decision. It is within the autonomy of the university to decide what courses of study will exist within that institution and whether or not there would be a new faculty or a new course created. However, I have asked the university to reply to some of the submissions that have been made and the applications by those people in the Italian community for a separate course and faculty in Italian. I am hoping to receive some word from the university immediately and then if necessary the application would be made to my ministry and processed in that way.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): There are only 330,000 Italians in Toronto. They teach Russian instead of Italian.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

PROPOSED INCREASES BY BELL

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Does the government of Ontario plan to appeal the recent decision of the Canadian Transport Commission concerning the telephone increases granted to Bell Canada?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this question I think would be more appropriately directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) but—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): When does he ever come in the House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, he is here quite regularly—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is always hard at work in the public interest.

Mr. Stokes: He is being briefed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for York Centre should know that better than most. I would say to the member for Windsor-Walkerville, the answer in any event is no.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the government then provide either financial assistance or manpower to assist Professor Lloyd Brown-John of the University of Windsor, who is waging a one-man fight against Bell Canada?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

SUDBURY COURT SITTINGS

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there have been two spring assizes of the high court in Sudbury and because the general sessions of the peace have been postponed again until almost the end of June for lack of a judge, could the Attorney General not provide some assistance so that in fact the hearings, which have been postponed since May 1 except for one week, could be held?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I had a discussion with the chief justice about this last week, and he indicated to me there were sittings in Sudbury last week. He anticipated that the cases would be finalized but if necessary he would contemplate further hearings this month.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the minister not aware that the judge has now indicated there is no judge available until June 26 to hear the remainder of the cases?

Hon. Mr. Bales: When the hon. member speaks of the judge, I am not sure if he is speaking of the high court or the county court. The high court? The justice of the high court was sitting there last week, I understood, and the chief justice indicated that a chief judge would be returning before the end of the month, which I think is quite satisfactory.

Mr. Martel: A further supplementary—possibly I've not got my point across: The general sessions of the peace have been postponed until June 26 for lack of a judge and the legal profession phoned me from Sudbury this morning, in view of the fact that all of their cases—

Mr. Singer: The whole profession?

Mr. Martel: Well, the member's colleague, the former member for Sudbury, was representing them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has not asked a question yet. Does he have a question?

Mr. Martel: Could the minister not insure that these cases could be heard before June 26?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, there are many arrangements that must be made, and as I indicated earlier a justice of the Supreme Court was in Sudbury last week hearing certain cases—at least I was so advised by the chief justice.

EXTENSION OF REGIONAL AID

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

Mr. P. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): I have a question of the Prime Minister.

As ongoing discussions have been taking place for some months between officials of the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs and federal officials in Ottawa with regard to extending beyond June 30 of this year the designation of Renfrew county and some other parts of the province under the federal regional expansion programme, can the Prime Minister advise the Legislature where the matter stands at this time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I can't tell the hon. member exactly where it stands at this precise moment. I corresponded with Mr. Marchand sometime in the latter part of April, indicating then the acceptance of the government of his proposal for the extension of the designated areas in Renfrew and Pembroke and indicating some areas where we thought the programme might be altered or improved.

I assume, Mr. Speaker, in that the proposal initially came from the Federal government and that we have reacted in a positive way, certainly to that aspect of it, that one could expect a positive response from the federal government sometime in the relatively near future, which would resolve the problem.

But at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I can only inform the hon. member that we did communicate to Mr. Marchand our acceptance of the extension of the designation.

Mr. Yakabuski: A supplementary: Doesn't the Prime Minister feel that because there is a federal election in the offing, the federal government is hardly likely to terminate that designation at this time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be the last one to make such assessments or judgements on the part of the federal government in Ottawa. I would say that as a matter of good common sense and logic, which one might not really translate to all of their activities, but using that as the basis I could only assume that they would continue—

Mr. Lewis: Answer, answer!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Pardon? Oh, yes!

Mr. Lewis: They are starting to quote the Premier in full in the press. It is very embarrassing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, they are. I have to be very careful.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only assume that, for whatever reason, they will extend the programme.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre was next, I believe.

NEW TORONTO AIRPORT

Mr. Deacon: My question is of the Minister of Treasury, Economic and Intergovernmental Affairs.

What additional persuaders, in addition to two years' free rent and $100 for attending a meeting, does the minister plan to offer in order to thrust his north Pickering blight on Toronto's green belt perimeter?

An hon. member: It's still wrong!

Mr. Deacon: Two years free rent!

Mr. Lewis: Three per cent mortgage!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the story which appeared in the Globe and Mail this morning, I think, was somewhat incorrect. No one was being offered $100 to attend a meeting. Under the Expropriation Procedures Act, an allowance of $100 is made because of—I've forgotten the wording—the inconvenience of an expropriation other than just an ordinary sale. It was certainly indicated to these people as they came in, that the province, in making the offer to them, is not, at this moment, expropriating but making available to them all of the things which normally would be available to them under the Expropriation Procedures Act; for example paying the legal fees if there is a negotiator and paying this $100; but it is not for coming to the meeting.

Mr. Deacon: Including the 10 per cent for forcible taking?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Pardon?

Mr. Deacon: Including the 10 per cent for forcible taking?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Including the 10 per cent for forcible taking? No! I don't think so.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the minister can tell the House who does deal with the public in these negotiations? Are they, in fact, employed by the government; or is this some company, which is offering its services, that has been employed as a unit rather than as a group of individuals?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I outlined to the House several weeks ago the procedures that we were following. We have taken on a great number of people. The project is directed by civil servants, and the property acquisition team is directed by a civil servant on loan from the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. We are using a number of other ministerial personnel in key positions. We have hired, I think, something like 50 or 100 appraisers on the one hand, and negotiators on the other side.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): By way of a further supplementary, if I may: Could the minister advise if he is paying these independent appraisers on a per diem or on a commission basis? If it is per diem, would the minister disclose what it is?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am almost sure it is on a per diem basis. I will have to get that information for the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

HIGHWAY 17 PAVING

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Could the minister indicate why paving has not commenced on Highway 17 west between Copper Cliff and Lively? Secondly, why has it not been started, since it has been prepared for six to eight months; and when will he begin the paving on it?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I will check into that. I'm sure there are valid reasons for it; I will check into it and get the answer for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

HERITAGE ONTARIO

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Solicitor General. Can he inform the House what action his department

or the government intends to take on the conference that was just completed over the weekend; what is going to come out of that conference and does he have a final price tag for the cost to the taxpayers of Ontario of this little party?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the conference, which was in my language, a smashing success—

Mr. Lewis: The minister doesn't read the papers.

An hon. member: Shush! Listen to his speech!

Mr. Lewis: Here we go!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and which involved far more people than even we had anticipated through the course of our planning, was one of the most complex conferences, bringing together peoples from all backgrounds.

Mr. Lewis: One of the best that has ever been held by the minister to date.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would say it was the best I've ever been involved in.

Mr. Lewis: In the world, perhaps?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That's right; it was exceedingly good!

Mr. Lewis: Exceedingly good! What a comedown!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: For the record, I brought it to the attention of many delegates that the NDP scoffs at all things associated with this kind of a concept.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: Was the minister at the conference?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: For the hon. member, using every available type of recording equipment, taping—

Mr. Shulman: He embarrasses me.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —electronics—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Oh, such sanctimony!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —hand-recording, we have come up with a package of recommendations and suggestions which will be placed before the government and reviewed.

I don't have the final costs, because it will be difficult to designate or allocate the cost to the specific three days since this was an ongoing process for a year, certainly of the last few months.

I may say this, that in speaking to one of the resource people. I said: "How much do you think it would have cost the province to hire the knowledge and expertise of the people involved?" He said: "I would estimate $1 million."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Mr. Lewis: That is surely an underestimate.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, on Dec. 1 last, letters patent were issued to His Honour, Judge I. A. Vannini, the judge of the district court of the district of Algoma, appointing him a sole commissioner to inquire into the circumstances respecting the conduct of the public and the members of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force at the Ontario Science Centre on Oct. 25, 1971. At that time, you will recall, Premier Kosygin of the USSR was a guest in this country.

This morning I met with Judge Vannini and received his report on behalf of the Premier. I am sure that all members of this House and the public at large will be interested in this report, as it relates directly to our fundamental right of freedom of speech and expression, which has been recognized for centuries under our system of government, and how the recognition and exercise of that right relates to law enforcement.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this report will receive wide distribution and the conclusions will be read in the full context of the report, and, in particular with reference to the remarks of the commissioner in the addendum thereto.

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the members of this House and the public, to thank His Honour Judge Vannini for undertaking a difficult and onerous task and discharging it in a most commendable manner.

In the discharge of his responsibilities it was necessary for him to hear 214 witnesses, whose evidence amounted to over 7,800 pages of transcript in 38 volumes. When you

consider the difficulty involved in sifting through so much evidence, you then appreciate the scope of the inquiry and the very difficult task undertaken by Judge Vannini.

I table a copy of the report.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

The hon. member for High Park.

SECURITIES ACT

Mr Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Securities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: May I point out there is a great deal of interruption taking place below the press gallery. I wonder if we could have a little more silence?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, in addition to the liability of an insider to compensate a person or a company for direct loss suffered as a result of use of confidential information in the manner specified, the bill makes it an offence to so use such information.

MORTMAIN AND CHARITABLE USES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, under the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, difficulties have arisen with those sections which provide that land assured for certain public purposes or devised for charitable uses must be used or occupied for such purposes or sold within two years from the date of the assurance or devise, otherwise they shall vest in the Public Trustee, who then causes a sale unless a judge otherwise orders.

It is not uncommon, in situations where there is a life estate, for the two-year period to pass before an application is made to the Supreme Court for an extension of time. In these circumstances, the land vests in the Public Trustee who may be obliged to sell the remainder interest when it is impractical to do so. This requirement could very well deprive a worthy charitable beneficiary or public purpose of the benefit of the remainder interest on the expiration of the life estate.

The amendment I am introducing today modifies the rule whereby the devise for charitable uses or the assurance for public purpose is given in a remainder interest. In this case the bill provides that the two-year limitation period starts to run from the termination of the life interest. This affords an opportunity for those responsible for the administration of the trust to ascertain whether the land can be used for the purpose of the trust or can advantageously be sold for the benefit of the trust after the expiration of the life tenancy.

COUNTY JUDGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the County Judges Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, with the increasing demands on the county courts in this province, it has become necessary to amend the County Judges Act on an almost annual basis. The amendment I am introducing today permits the Lieutenant Governor in Council, by order in council filed under the Regulations Act, to increase the number of additional judges that may be required from time to time.

I wish to advise the members of this House that again, this year, at the request of the chief judge and after review by the ministry, the number of additional judges required by that court will be increased from 20 to 23. This, of course, will require complementary legislation from Parliament, and I will be making the necessary representations to the Minister of Justice in Ottawa in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (*continued*)

On vote 2202:

Mr. Chairman: I believe when we rose we were still on item 2. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, you will recall I was speaking.

Mr. Chairman: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Lawlor: I was speaking, Mr. Chairman, at the time we rose. I was on my feet at the time—

Mr. Chairman: I was not aware of that. The hon. member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. Lawlor: I'm not going to stay on my feet much longer. I had been speaking about moral education — what went into it and what were the considerations that would surround it, in my opinion.

May I further say that it seemed to me that the Mackay report as such was never adequately, or even really glancingly, dissected since the time that report was presented to this House three years ago. To my knowledge the matter has never been given any great consideration. I thought last Friday that the ruling principles that might govern this topic would have some relevancy and that they applied partially to the area of religious education.

However, it seems to me a kind of waste of breath to pursue the issue. My words fall like black rain on infertile territory, I feel, and I am not going to go ahead with it. It is a waste of time. The minister quotes me a passage from Proverbs which says that sometime in the distant millennial future of the human race these problems will still be with us. Of course they will. Whoever said anything different?

It seems to say, "Well this airy fairy nonsense has little relevancy to what we're seeking to achieve in this House." I say to you in return, that the only thing that you're trying to seek, and you totally fail, is in terms of teaching wisdom. The whole generation lacks it. You lack it. The government lacks it. The whole educational system's bereft of it. Wisdom is the only thing worth knowing. So, as far as I'm concerned, keep it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville—and I believe we're on item 2. There's a mark in my book indicating item 1 has been completed.

Mr. B. Newman: I'm referring to item 2, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2, regional services.

Mr. B. Newman: I wanted to ask the minister, what is the reason for the substantial increase in the estimates from some $7.9 million to $9.7 million? I would assume that under the reorganization system, this estimate for regional services would have substantially decreased, rather than increased.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is in the year previous to the last fiscal year. There's actually a $325,000 decrease this year from last year; you're going back to the year before that.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): We are going in the right direction.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't have that information at this time.

Mr. B. Newman: I am checking the wrong two columns.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on item 2? The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): I have four basic points. First of all, I'd like to know how many regional offices there are in the province and what is the total number of employees connected with the regional services. I'd like to know how much the central administration and supervision has declined, both in terms of budgetary figures and in terms of personnel, since the introduction of the regional offices. And fourth, I would like to know what are the present plans that, I understand, exist for the phasing out of the Metro regional office?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, there are 10 regional offices. The total staff authorized commitment for this fiscal year is 482; the complement for the last fiscal year was 515.

Anything that indicates that the Metro regional offices are being phased out is, of course, premature, because what is taking place is that a task force on the regional organization of the ministry and its relationship with the local school boards, division boards, city boards and that, is now being carried on. As a matter of fact, I think today they start their public hearings. I indicated we would have public hearings in this regard and these public hearings start today.

When this task force has completed its work, they will then make the recommendations to us as to what should be our regional office setup. They could conceivably come in and recommend more regional offices; they could recommend fewer offices; they could recommend no regional offices—or no regional offices in some areas. They could recommend a different character to the regional offices in other areas.

This is what we've asked this task force to do and we expect a report in about five months. By October.

Mr. Foulds: The minister missed one question. Let me rephrase it. Has there been a decline in central administrative personnel since the burgeoning of the regional offices some five to eight years ago?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think it's safe to say that there has been a small decrease in staff. We are in such a state of flux at the minute—there are so many functions of the ministry that are being transferred—that it's very difficult sometimes to make absolute comparisons. Then also connected with this is the general decrease because of the financial belt-tightening that we're all going through. There are a certain number of complement positions that we've cut out this year in this process.

But the final rationalization of the whole thing will come when we have the recommended structure for the regional offices. Then we'll be able to relate that new structure to what we have in head office and find out exactly where the personnel should be. Also, as part of the new reorganized set-up, we're putting emphasis, in some areas, on not hiring staff but rather seconding people from school systems on contracts of one, two or more years.

Mr. Foulds: I wonder if the minister could just indicate to the House the present philosophy of his department on the function of the regional offices? It seems to me that—if I could editorialize for a minute, Mr. Chairman—we have the regional school board officials and administrations; we have the department's regional offices and administration doing some supervising, or consulting and supplying certain services; and then we have the central government administrative setup. I'm just trying to clarify in my own mind, at least, the interrelation between these three tiers of structures within the educational structure.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that the basic philosophy behind the regional offices was to put, in various sections of the province, an office with a group of people, ministry employees, who could carry the message out into the local areas. Now you'll have to remember that the regional office structure was set up before the large school areas, so that we really have to think back to that. The idea there was that there were many boards in this province, and sometimes Queen's Park was very far removed. So this was an attempt to put in 10 areas across the province—a point of contact for them, where word about curriculum and grants and various things could be transmitted and they could work closely with ministry staff.

The other function of the regional offices was to fill in the gaps. In other words, we know that there are unequal resources available even today. Every board doesn't have the potential that other boards have in all areas, and in some cases the regional office was able to fill that gap. Whereas, for instance, the regional office in Metropolitan Toronto wouldn't need to fill many gaps in types of service, in other areas of the province the regional office might have certain people with skills who aren't available in the local boards, and they could fill that gap for those boards.

But I think the important thing to realize, Mr. Chairman, is that, basically, our present regional structure came in before the larger units of administration, and that's precisely why we're taking a very careful look at them now. Because in some cases what their function was then, may not need to be their function now. We have to have this resolved by the time this report comes in in October.

Mr. Foulds: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I just hope the minister understands me. I'm not necessarily opposing the regional offices. I think in many ways the concept is a good one, but I am concerned—as the minister has indicated he is, because the task force itself is being implemented—that there isn't competition, say, between the regional school board offices and the department's regional offices, that they are complementing one another. I know in the northwestern region, some of the regional people there have performed very valuable functions, particularly even today with the outlying school boards being restricted in many ways.

I'd like to move on to another point, the point that I raised in my introductory remarks. What is the relationship between your department now, Mr. Minister, the Department of Education, and such organizations as the Theatre Hour Co. which tours the schools with performances and theatre workshops and that kind of thing? I understand the grants come to them from the province of Ontario Council for the Arts through the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, but it seems to me because they primarily service and fill a very great need in the elementary and the secondary school systems that your department must at some point have some relation to them.

The reason I bring it up under this area of regional services is that it seems to me to be a natural area when we are talking about regional disparities, and it seems to me that this kind of activity is one of those that helps overcome regional disparities. If you wish me to talk about this in another area I would be glad to do so.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As to the relationship with our ministry, there is a Miss Helen Dunlop in the curriculum development branch who provides a liaison with a group such as the Theatre Hour Co. Now, as you have indicated, basically they receive their money from the Council for the Arts and deal with the local school boards in arranging to present their programmes, but Miss Dunlop provides the liaison in anything to do with our ministry.

Mr. Foulds: Are there any other organizations or functions that might be parallel to the Theatre Hour Co. tours of the schools? Are there any other kinds of activities that your department gets into in terms of other travelling exhibits or groups?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Actually, nothing comes to mind at the moment that actually parallels the Theatre Hour Co., but we are presently trying to work out how best the resources, for instance, of the Art Gallery and the Royal Ontario Museum can best be used by the students of this province. We are presently looking into this in the social development committee because these groups are funded by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities or by the Council for the Arts.

Actually, a lot of their work can be useful to the school children of this province and we are presently looking at different ways—of doing this. For example, is it better to take exhibits out and get them around to the various school boards, or is it better to try to work out arrangements so the kids themselves can come down and see these right here. These are the kinds of things we are looking at.

The only other thing that comes to my mind, Mr. Chairman, is the Hamilton Police Band. We give them a grant and they perform in a lot of schools around this province. I guess their basic function, as well as entertaining the students, is to try to give them a good feeling about the policemen and the law.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Excellent band.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Excellent group.

Mr. Deans: Excellent group.

Mr. Foulds: That seems to me to be very hopeful, Mr. Minister, that your department is investigating it. I just didn't quite catch the committee—the social development committee?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The social development committee of cabinet. That is the committee of which Mr. Welch is the chairman. It comprises Colleges and Universities, Health, Community and Social Services and my ministry.

Mr. Foulds: It seems a very logical place.

Items 2 and 3 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: On item 4, the member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, on item 4, I would like to place on the record a letter which I received some months ago now and it deals with a matter with which the minister must be increasingly familiar from day to day—the matter of retarded children. We have had a lot of Ministers of Education in recent years and we have had a lot of promises in this field but the problem still seems to remain.

This is from a constituent of mine addressed to me and it says:

Dear Sir:

As the parents of a four-year-old retarded daughter, we wish to thank the Ontario government for recent legislation making school attendance for the retarded compulsory and for the additional support given for the daycare training.

However, we feel that in the area of residences we have been badly let down. The facilities presently available fall far short of the need. Smaller local permanent residences are urgently required. To date these are few and far between and the Ontario government must be made aware of these glaring inadequacies.

The present health and welfare system provides quite adequately for people of average intelligence who in many cases are capable of finding for themselves, while the mentally retarded, unable to cope in many instances, seem to be shuffled from pillar to post.

Parents of retardees in the large institutions, Orillia for one, plainly are being pressured to bring their children back into the community. Parents of younger se-

verely retarded children who will soon require custodial care find themselves in a similar situation. Older parents with a young child who will probably outlive them have a need as well. What are these people to do?

The seeming lack of interest at many government levels is no doubt due to a lack of awareness of the magnitude of this urgent problem, rather than apathy on the part of many elected representatives. We hope that you, however, will give this problem its proper attention.

In this letter that I bring to the minister's attention and ask for his comment, there are several points. Of course, it may make sense for some of the pupils in Orillia to be returned to the community if they are able to cope with the community once more. It may well be that graduates of that institution should be urged to come back and establish themselves, if they can. But if it is a matter of space, and simply a matter of space, and the urgency of those who must get in there pushing others out, then it becomes a very serious situation.

The other thing that is mentioned here is a matter which also has been of great concern to some of the people in my area, and I have had several letters about it—it is, older parents with young children or older children who are mentally retarded. I think of one particular case where the parents are getting along in years; they have a daughter who is now in her late twenties and yet is not in a position to earn even a dime for herself or look after herself. Her parents are very concerned as to what is going to happen to her when they pass on. They don't know how they can make proper provision for her because they are not wealthy people and they are on a very limited income.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister would comment on what is projected for people in these categories, both the younger children and their parents, and what is projected in the way of residences where these children can be properly looked after so that the overcrowding in our institutions can be overcome. And, secondly, what long-range provision is being made for those older mentally retarded people who cannot cope for themselves and whose parents eventually will not be able to look after them?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, this of course is a very important subject and one that was dealt with at great length, and in quite a fine manner by the Williston report and by subsequent statements made by some of my colleagues.

I think I could discuss at length some of the matters that my friend has brought up, but really most of those things that he wants to discuss are not within the purview of my ministry. In other words, our involvement in special education is in the education for the educable retarded in the regular school system. The provision of community residences and taking care of the older retarded who find that their parents or guardians or relatives have passed on and there is no place for them in the community any more—these things come under the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Because they are all interrelated to a degree, of course, we have been studying these in a co-ordinated manner in our cabinet committee on social development. But I really have nothing in my estimates or have any responsibility for the provision of residences, for which there is provision under legislation that the Minister of Community and Social Services administers. The Ministry of Health also, you know, has new plans to build smaller community-type facilities rather than the large Orillia-type facilities to take care of some of the situations which you have mentioned.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for his answer, and I can appreciate the problem here; this is exactly the problem I think the parents do have—they find it difficult, as I find it difficult, to pin down the responsibility because these people have their interests spread over many areas. Since the Ministry of Health estimates are now under way downstairs, perhaps that's the place for me to go and repeat the process.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Community and Social Services.

Mr. Young: Community and Social Services, yes. So that I'll see what I can find out there.

The problem, of course, is, Mr. Chairman, that these people have been shunted from pillar to post, as the lady has said. They are divided up among these various departments and it is hard for any parent to know exactly where to go. It is very difficult for members of the Legislature and perhaps for ministers themselves.

Certainly it seems to me here is an area where there should be greater co-ordination than there is right now. Surely there must be

a way by which people in such desperate need and parents in such desperate need can be dealt with in one overall bundle, if you will.

I'll take this up again with the other department, but it just seems to me that here is a matter which has been neglected. We have heard a great deal in reports about what is projected, yet those reports don't seem to translate into actual action which meets the need of people such as the person whose letter I've just read.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): They are being translated, Fred, at Picton Heights.

Mr. Young: One place—it doesn't touch the need.

Mr. Deans: On a matter directly related with what the member for Yorkview has said—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I want to raise it as delicately as I can, because I don't want to raise the ire of anyone by doing so. I have discussed with a number of parents of retarded children the problems that they have during the summertime. Many of the children are educable—I have a little trouble with that word—they can be educated, but they have real problems in that the parents have them home during the months of late June, July and August.

I've wondered whether the department has given any consideration to having a half-day school or some kind of educational facility available during the summer months for those children. I'm not talking about keeping them in school 12 months of the year, but I do find from speaking to the parents that because the children are away from the more formal atmosphere of the school system, their learning falls back considerably during the summer months and then when they start over again in September they are back to where they began in perhaps the previous January.

Not only that, but it does present something of a burden—that is maybe not a very good choice of words, but it is perhaps difficult for a mother with other children to cope with a child who has become accustomed to a fairly routine life during the fall and winter period, where they are under some laid-down procedures and carefully supervised programmes. The mother has to try to provide this child, who has a disability, with any kind of meaningful programme which will keep him occupied in the summer months and at the same time has to pay the kind of attention that they must pay to some of the very small children that they have around the house.

As I say, it is delicate because I might get a parent who comes rasping in at me telling me that they don't mind having their child home in the summer and by all means they ought to have them if they want them there. But I think that for a great many they would be able to put to good use any kind of ongoing facility that the Ministry of Education would be able to provide.

I would like to suggest that maybe we could take a look at making use of some of the younger people in society, who are quite well able to provide a very minimal educational function within the educational structure. They could provide at a very low cost, maybe two half days a week, or something along that line, of ongoing education for those retarded children who could make good use of it themselves and whose parents would find it very helpful to them.

I wonder if the minister has given consideration to perhaps offering some kind of direction for a programme such as that from Queen's Park to the local boards—by giving additional moneys, or additional assistance if money isn't the problem, to provide that kind of facility.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I would say in answer to that that it should, of course, be remembered that the boards are only beginning to move into the full total day programme now. In fact they only have to begin it next September, although some of them have already moved into it ahead of our mandatory date. They are really only beginning to provide full schooling from five till 21 for these educable retarded children full-time in the school year. I know and appreciate the problem the hon. member is raising. It's a very acute problem in this particular area.

Many mothers tell me it's a problem with all young kids; after the novelty of the first week of summer wears off they would all like them to attend something. In fact, in many communities the parks and recreation branch or the recreational people provide either half-time or full-time play schools for the summer and so forth.

Mr. Deans: Yes, for normal children.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes. I think that this is certainly an area in which I can't offer you any answer now, but it is an area, I think, that could be considered. I'd suggest that the people who are interested in this should talk to the local branches of the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded. They are very keenly aware of this problem and have organized camp programmes, but again they can't take care of everybody. They are trying to have expanded camp programmes. I see no reason why something couldn't be worked out with the facilities which are available in the schools for some kind of summer programme. Perhaps we will move to that.

Mr. Deans: I would like to follow up on that for a second or two. I'd like to suggest to the minister that he might send out some form of notice or letter or whatever it may be—I'm not saying directive but some letter—indicating to the local boards that they should give some consideration to making it known in the community that the facilities of the school system or at least some of the facilities of the school system could be made available in the summer for groups of persons who would be interested in providing a service of this kind.

In my own area, for example, I had a group of young people come to me. They asked if I might be able to assist them in raising money to provide just such a programme in the area of Hamilton for this coming summer for retarded children. It got the endorsation of every major group concerned about retardation or concerned about children or, for that matter, concerned about health but somehow or other no level of government seems to be able to come up with the $10,000 that we need in order to make this thing work.

I'd like to ask the minister, along that line, if his department would consider proposing the expenditure of $8,000 to $10,000 on a pilot project in the Hamilton area to allow these people to put into practice a very good programme which they have devised which would provide this service for a good number of young children in the area. I can't tell you how many. Let's see how it works out.

Maybe we could propose that as the model for other communities which might be interested in doing the same kind of thing. These people are sitting wondering if, in fact, they are going to be able to do anything along that line. I've tried a number of different areas including the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) of this government. He's very interested in the programme but he says he doesn't think he's got enough money to fund it. Maybe the Department of Education would consider helping us along that line? I can show you a very good outline.

Hon. Mr. Wells: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is if you would like to send us the outline of it, I'll take a look at it. I can't tell you without looking at it.

Mr. Deans: I will go and get it right now.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the department, I think, does operate a programme in the Summer 72 programme that maybe could be directed to take care of the subject under discussion right now. I would think that either that programme or some phase of the Summer 72 programme or the local initiatives programme could be a substitute for what we are discussing here. I think there would be enough concerned individuals in any given community who would undertake just such a type of programme not only for the two months of the summer but even the four months when university students are not attending school.

I wanted to ask the minister at this time if, in the provision of special education services, the Department of Education would consider allowing boards of education to purchase special services from either adjoining boards or, if they are not available there, from private sources? There are individuals who operate various types of commercial kindergartens and special education sevices who could possibly provide that service to individuals to take care, especially, of individuals who may have some type of learning disability.

I make mention of this as the result of a brief submitted by the Ontario Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. Its recommendation number 12 that:

> Local school boards be permitted to purchase special services from private sources, if they are unable to provide for the education of a handicapped child and are unable to purchase appropriate services from a neighbouring board of education.

Is the department considering such a recommendation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, our policy at the present time is that there is no hesitation about the board purchasing services from another board. This is quite permissible and, indeed, is done. Our policy on purchasing

services from private school boards or private agencies is that we haven't approved them to this date. It is something we would be happy to look at; but there are fairly broad ramifications to this going beyond just this particular area. We haven't really arrived at any resolution of the matter of allowing boards to purchase services for their pupils from private groups.

Mr. B. Newman: There are private services in the community. If there are only half a dozen parents who require that type of service I would think it would be cheaper to be purchasing it from a private organization rather than having the local board set up that type of a service. I think it could be a forward step and I would hope the minister's department would look seriously at that. If it is as worthy as the organization makes mention, then it should be implemented.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4? The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: There are four or five points again, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to touch on. I wonder if I could first get a clarification from the minister of what is involved in special education services in this vote. It seems to me that the amount of money is really very small in comparison to the need in special education, if special education encompasses the area that I feel it should—that is, the area of learning disabilities, the handicaps that poorer people have from the inner-city schools, the guidance sector of the system for those people, the retarded children and the special and physically handicapped children?

Are all these included in this item in this vote?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, vote 2202, item 4, represents only the central office officials concerned with the area of special education, nine professional staff plus the secretaries, the publications, the travel, etc., that goes with this branch. Just for the member's information, I might itemize some of the other things.

The regional services vote, which was just passed, contained funds for 10 programme consultants and eight regional special education consultants who work in our 10 regional offices. Research funds in this area are found elsewhere in the various research votes. Most of the moneys to support the special education programmes at the local board level are found in the general grant to boards of education. Then grants to our section 12 boards operating education for crippled children are found in another area. Our hospital schools, schools for the blind and the deaf, are in the last vote.

So, actually, all through our estimates are moneys for special education. This item here merely focuses on our central staff.

Mr. Foulds: Would it be possible—I know that this is a very difficult thing to do at this stage—at some time before we finish discussing the estimate, to put together an approximate figure of the moneys allocated to special education from the regional services, the grants to the local boards and so forth. I know it is impossible to do it immediately, but even an approximation or a percentage would do. It is this kind of thing that I am interested in.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Does the hon. member mean the money we spend apart from the grants to the local boards for special education?

Mr. Foulds: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There is a big part of the per pupil grants in the general grants vote, weighting factors—

Mr. Foulds: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —and so forth, that is provided for special education. But you mean apart from that?

Mr. Foulds: Is it possible to determine that amount as well since you have distributed it so widely?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is a little more difficult. Of course, our basic philosophy now is not to separate this as much as we might have done, even a few years ago.

Mr. Foulds: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In other words, these are pupils in our schools. We try to treat them normally. There are special weighting factors in the grant rates for boards which have greater expenses. Basically, however, they are general grants for students and it is very difficult to separate them.

Mr. Foulds: Perhaps when we get to that vote—I guess it is 2203—we could just discuss the weighting factor at that point, which would be relatively simple.

There are a couple of other points however. I guess this is the only vote in which I can make a few general comments on the special education services in the province. It seems to me that this is an area in which

we aren't nearly doing the work that should and must be done. I think we are getting to the point in the system where we are beginning to recognize the importance and value of diagnosing the so-called learning disabilities, and once again that term is used so widely it has become a catch-all phrase, it has become a cliché unfortunately.

But I would like to put on record at least my feeling that diagnosing is surely only the first step in the problem. Unfortunately, once we diagnose the student's problem in terms of say reading, whether it is a perceptual handicap or an audio handicap, we tend to say, "Well, that's fine. We've diagnosed the problem." We don't really do enough work, it seems to me in taking the diagnosis and making sure that the child can then function more adequately within the school system. There seems to me to be a terrible lack in our school services there.

The other point that I want to go into—and I want to read a couple of excerpts, if I may—is this whole question that has continually haunted me—and haunted is not too strong a term—the problem that is faced by the child who doesn't easily adapt to the school system because of the background from which he comes.

I suppose the most stark example was the brief that was presented to the Toronto Board of Education's management committee by a group of people known as the Park School Community Council. I think that brief makes some very valid points about students in the inner-city schools. The problems that they pinpoint in terms of special education seem to me to be quite valid. And I am sure none of us here would even inadvertently claim that people from the inner-city areas are innately less capable than those from the suburban middle-class area.

The problem that faces them is unleashing that innate ability that all students have in roughly the same proportions and in roughly the same variety of talents. We face a particular problem in areas such as the inner-city schools—and we face some of the same problems in the more remote rural schools—the kids are, for want of a better term, the old cliché, the culturally deprived. And what we do, it seems to me, unfortunately, with the best of intentions in the world, is channel these kids so early into those vocational or manual skill classes.

It seems to me what we should be trying to do to the best of our ability with special education, is helping them catch up, if you like, so that they can find their own natural level and their own natural talent within the streams that we have in the school system; without being channelled into an area of activity too early on in their career.

It seems to me that what happens is they sometimes get channelled into those classes, which are termed "for children with limited ability." It's kind of self-defeating in that it's not that their ability is limited; it's that at that point in time their modes of perception are not the same as the middle-class children for whom, by and large, the system is designed.

It is a system that tends to reinforce the values of the middle-class. It is a system that uses middle-class models. It's even a system that uses middle-class discipline, if you like.

The problem faced by kids from the culturally deprived areas, either the inner-city schools or the more remote rural schools, is that we don't really give them the individual attention that we need to give them so that they can come to their full potential. And I think that special education should be spending, or we should be placing more of our emphasis in special education on that problem area, rather than on the channelling of the children.

I just want to read a paragraph or two from an article carried in the Toronto Star Nov. 16. It contained excerpts from the Park School Community Council brief. Here is one of the things, it seems to me, it brings home. It says:

> What the every student survey tells us is that these lowest-stream classes are filled with students from poor and working class homes, and that as you move up on the social and economic hierarchy of this city [Toronto] there is less and less chance of your child ending up in one of these bottom streams. How did it come about that all these poor and working class children ended up in the bottom stream and not in the top?

I think that's a fundamental question that people connected with special education should consider. They go on to say that the particular present approach is a kind of "benevolent fatalism; well meaning, but essentially dead-ended." And it's an approach that they object to. What they ask for, and I think they have a right; I feel very strongly they have a right to ask for a genuine equal opportunity; even if that equal opportunity for their children costs us a little more to provide.

I'll get into my remarks about guidance and streaming, and so on, very briefly a little later on.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Just to briefly reply and review what the hon. member said: I think perhaps the point he raises is that there is certainly need for special education for various services for skilled teachers and back-up services in the school to identify not only the problem, but to be able to prescribe the correct learning environment which will benefit that student. I think we are making great progress in this area. I am heartened by the number of teachers who are taking the summer courses in special education; the people who will be taking the course at York University now that we have a special course there where emphasis will be placed on special education.

General courses are being given to all teachers now so that they will more readily recognize people with some kind of learning defect. I think that over the long haul this will bear great fruit in the whole system.

The other thing that the hon. member talks about is the channelling of people who obviously have no learning defects but perhaps have some kind of cultural or language defect which is hindering their progress and which has been misidentified as a special education case; it has been misinterpreted. I completely agree with him.

I think we have to be very sure that this isn't done in our system—that because of some other factor, someone is assumed to have a learning disability and is shunted into that programme. I think that this occurs much less now than perhaps it did.

Under the new credit system, particularly in secondary school, and with teachers who live within the spirit and really accept their responsibility in this system, I think we will have an even greater opportunity for these students to develop. Certainly, I would support the premise that we have to be sure that this doesn't happen in our system. We have to do those things that will make sure it doesn't.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 4 carried?

Mr. Foulds: I wanted to make one comment—perhaps we could discuss this under the architecture vote in terms of the physically handicapped. Are there any special programmes in the department for physically handicapped children? I am thinking of programmes rather than physical plant adjustments that are necessary.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We have a task force within the department to try to develop guidelines for schools so that they will have provisions in the school buildings for the physically handicapped.

I must say that in most of the schools I go to I find very little provision for this. Until just a few years ago, we accepted that anyone with a physical disability as great as would require special facilities would be going to a special school. We are getting away from that. I recall the arguments I went through when I was on a school board, just to have an elevator put in a school. I have been in several new schools recently which have elevators in them—many of them. They are there not for general use but for use by anyone who needs them. I think we are aware of this and we are working on it.

Mr. Foulds: We might talk about that a little bit more when we get to the architecture vote, Mr. Minister. I was thinking more of programmes because surely there are some subjects which are regularly programmed with which physically handicapped people have some difficulties. Are there special allowances made in terms of the credits that they need to achieve? Are there any guidelines the department sets down to help them with this problem?

Hon. Mr. Wells: There are, of course, the special boards that provide education to crippled children's centres. They, of course, have their own programmes which are all geared to those students. I think that if these students were found in the regular school it would be up to the board and the staff there to make provisions. They would probably have to work out some special things in physical education but in a lot of other courses there would be no particular problem.

Mr. Chairman: Are items 4 and 5 agreed to? On item 6—teacher education—the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make a few comments on this item. One is has the department undertaken some type of a manpower survey for the needs in the ensuing year and a projected survey for the needs in possibly the next five years? It is strange—I shouldn't say strange—but we certainly do realize that we goofed somewhere along the way when we find hundreds of teachers in this present year unable to get any type of employment in the profession of their choice. I was simply wondering if the minister has forecasts for the manpower needs in education for, say, the coming year and the next five years?

Hon. Mr. Wells: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we do have forecasts; and as I indicated earlier in my remarks, actually we have many forecasts. The thing that bothers me from time to time is that they don't always agree.

Certain groups of people have been doing forecasting on teacher supply and demand for the next 10 years; and it's an area where it's sometimes hard to come up with some definite, positive figures.

The most authoritative figure which we have right now is that for September, 1973, we will need about 3,500 to 3,800 elementary school teachers. We'll probably need another 2,500 to 3,000 in secondary schools.

Now, I mentioned these figures the other day at a teacher education conference, because I think that we have to tell young people the situation as we foresee it at the time when they will be graduating and looking for jobs. And that basically is the way it looks to us now. This is the number that would be hired from teachers' colleges or colleges of education. Of course, there will probably be a greater number of jobs available; but there will also be other people coming into the system from sources other than new graduates from teachers' colleges.

It surprised me to find out that last year there were 10,000 teachers who left teaching, both elementary and secondary schools, for one reason or another. Then, of course, there were a number who came in, including new graduates, to fill up those positions; plus the new positions that were created. Mr. Chairman, those are the figures that we have at the present time for next September. As I indicated earlier, I intend to table within about three or four weeks a general statement on a master plan for teacher education. It will outline the timetable for the integration of the present teachers' colleges with universities and outline the projections for the next 10 years; and give a pretty full story on what is happening in teacher education. Now that won't be ready for at least three to six weeks.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the minister what criteria are used for an individual who decides he wants to go to a college of education. How is he admitted? Are there qualifications or regulations that are set down, or is graduation from a university sufficient for the individual to attend; or is it on a first-come, first-served basis?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's on the basis of academic qualifications; such things as a bachelor of arts degree. And if there is acceptance by the committee on admissions to the college of education, or faculty of education.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, suppose they have all of those degrees; they qualify academically. But who and what decides as to whether they are going to be accepted or not?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The university's faculty decides who will be accepted.

Mr. B. Newman: I am now referring to attending a college of education after having received a university degree; the individual planning to attend Althouse in London, or a college in Toronto. How is the selection made as to who is going to attend and who is not going to attend?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I am informed it is made just the same as applying to any other university programme or graduate programme. You apply to the university and they have their own procedures for deciding who will be admitted; to Althouse, Toronto, or McArthur.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, that still doesn't answer the problem. If an individual contacts me as a member, saying he has applied to Althouse and has been refused, with no explanation whatsoever as to why he is not being accepted; I think it's incumbent upon the university to state at the time they refuse him the reasons why they would not accept him. If there are others who are more qualified, you can't fight that—you know, you are taking the cream of the crop—but how does he know the selection isn't on some other type of basis.

Hon. Mr. Wells: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that I get requests from constituents of mine, as I am sure the hon. member does, for various university faculties. I seem to have had quite a number of them recently concerning law school, and all I can do is phone somebody at the university and ask them. They will either tell me or they won't; they may say, "There were only 80 positions and over 2,000 applications, and we had to use our own discretion."

I suspect that the situation with respect to the education faculty right now is not quite the same as the law faculty. It is probably the other way around. Probably most people who apply are accepted, but as to why a person was accepted I don't know and we wouldn't know in our ministry.

Mr. B. Newman: I can understand that, Mr. Chairman, but if the colleges of education were to state in their letter the reason for non-acceptance—for instance, that there is a surplus in a given line—then the individual has something to fall back on. But simply to get a "no" answer isn't sufficient for the individual. He immediately looks inward and thinks there is something wrong with him because the college of education has refused him. I think it is incumbent upon them to provide a little more information when they are turning the individual down.

If you applied for a passport with the federal government and couldn't get one, you would certainly want to know why you couldn't get one. I think the colleges of education likewise should be informing those who have applied. Are there restrictions by your department as to the number who can go?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that the Ministry of Colleges and Universities has restrictions on the total number of places, undergraduate and post-graduate, that each institution has for certain courses, but we don't have any restrictions on the number of places.

I would be very surprised if anyone has been turned down for the very reason that there is a surplus of teachers available. I understand that everyone gets an interview; there is a selection committee, and somewhere in the process and they all have a chance to talk to the members of that selection committee.

But I would agree with your basic premise. I think that, as with many things in society today, there has been a tendency for universities in the past to feel that it was their God-given right to either pick or not pick somebody and not to tell you why, just to say. "I'm sorry, you're not admitted." In keeping with what we do in many other areas, I see no reason why a reason couldn't be put down. I'd be glad to discuss it with my colleague, the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Mr. B. Newman: I would appreciate that, because I think they should be telling the individuals why they are not being accepted. They can give any reason they wish—I would accept that—but simply to say "no" isn't a good answer at all.

May I ask of the minister, now that we will be in the credit system in the coming year, and since there may be courses set up in the schools that will require teachers only on a part-time basis because certain types of subjects may not be as popular as they may have anticipated them to be, is it the intention of the department to permit part-time teachers in the school system and do they intend to certify them to teach on a part-time basis?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, certainly the boards are free to hire teachers on a part-time basis, and I think one of the situations we had in recent years—and whether this will continue or not, I don't know—is that a number of the people who have letters of permission at the present time are in fact teaching in these part-time courses. This occurs because the board hasn't been able to hire a part-time person with teaching certification to take these courses, because up until now they have been employed full-time in some teaching capacity. But they wanted to give the course, so they found someone without the basic certification, then asked us for and we have issued letters of permission for them to do that. We will have to wait and see; but it may be that some people who haven't been able to find a full-time job and are fully certified will engage in part-time teaching.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the department considering the issuing of certificates for part-time teaching? The reason why I make mention of this, Mr. Chairman, is that I happen to have a certificate from the Florida State Department of Education, and it's kind of novel. I think there's some merit in some of their certification and the various areas they do have. For example, they have under the instructional level, at which the individual is certified to teach, adult, elementary, secondary 7 to 12, junior college, elementary and secondary, vocational, industrial, technical, junior high school grades 7 to 9, and two blank areas for others that could be typed in.

Then, again, they also have their certificate good for a specified period of time. It isn't permanent. Once the individual graduates from teachers' college and fills in his two or three years, it becomes permanent. The one I happen to have is good for a 10-year period. They, likewise, certify the individual for advanced post-graduate, special post-graduate, post-graduate, provisional post-graduate, graduate, professional, provisional graduate, provisional undergraduate, temporary, continuing part-time, life professional, special, life first grade, life special, life primary, second grade, provisional standard, standard, post-standard, temporary, substitute, temporary non-academic. They have 26 different categories here for part-time teaching.

Is the department considering something as elaborate as this, or is it still going to follow just the giving of the certificate and allowing the individual to teach practically any subject in the school?

Hon. Mr. Wells: First, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should clarify the point. The point of part-time or full-time employment is a contractual arrangement with the school board, as to whether you'll work full-time or part-time. It really has nothing to do with the certification. The certification process is—

Mr. B. Newman: This certificate is for part-time teaching.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, we aren't considering that. I'm not sure that there's any particular merit in having it. You either have the qualifications or certifications to be a teacher or you don't. Whether you decide to be employed full-time or part-time, I think, that is your particular choice and depends on the kind of the arrangement you can make with a board. I suppose that the trend in this jurisdiction has been away from, and is away from that sort of multitude of different certifications for all kinds of different things. We've issued some position papers that have suggested that we should condense our certifications into a basic teaching certification, with certain other things attached to it, and not even have an elementary and a secondary.

This is in the whole area of public discussion now between the teachers, their associations, the ministry, school boards and other people. We basically felt that in the kind of era that we're living in now you need more flexibility, and that by narrowing people into very narrow certification slots, you don't have the flexibility, that is, within the board, to be able to interchange personnel as changing patterns develop, or for the teachers themselves, who may find that they have a job for this year, but because their specialty or course is out, there's nowhere for them to move within the environment where they have been working.

So, we basically felt that to provide this flexibility there should be more emphasis on a basic teaching certification and then, perhaps, something above that, but not the kind of multitude of narrow ones that Florida has.

Mr. B. Newman: I think the minister is right in his approach. I would hesitate to come along and adopt the Florida system. The one portion of the Florida system that I do like is that at least if an individual is going to teach part-time in the school system you know he is a certified teacher, teaching that subject part-time, whereas today you are simply taking someone who may be a specialist in the field—they know the field well—but may not necessarily know how to teach. In my athletic experience I found that some of the best basketball and football players, even gymnasts, couldn't impart their knowledge to others at all, whereas those who may have learned the hard way and weren't too proficient in the activity really had a skill for imparting knowledge to others. I do think, as I did make mention, Mr. Minister, that at least from the part-time basis there is some merit in certification. I would hesitate to see teachers in nine different categories and in 20 different part-time teaching categories.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Maybe I will take a trip to Florida and find out how they qualify for that—

Mr. Foulds: We will be glad to go along as a task force.

Hon. Mr. Wells: To see how they qualify for that part-time certificate.

Mr. B. Newman: I will go down with you, Mr. Minister, to check on it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Commission that jet right now!

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he could tell me something about teacher education in the drug abuse field? I have just completed a study of glue and solvent abuse in the Hamilton area and I am more than a little concerned about the educational system's handling of the whole area of glue, solvent and drug abuse. I would like to know from the minister just exactly what it is that is being taught to teachers, if they are being taught anything at all, and what by way of recommendations are being made on an ongoing way that will alter the presentations that are presently being made to youngsters in regard to use and abuse of drugs and other things of a like nature?

It seemed to me—not only to me, it seemed to the whole research group that was working on the project—that much of the emphasis was placed on the showing of movies and bringing in of the so-called expert, a person perhaps from the Drug Addiction Research Foundation or from some other agency similar to that. We came to the conclusion that

it would be better to have these people teaching the teacher what the problems are and the things that ought to be taught, than to have the people directly involved in teaching the child; that in fact by bringing in the expert and making a rather large thing out of drug education you tended to whet the appetite of the child rather than to teach in an ongoing way the hazards and problems that are a part of drug and solvent use and abuse.

I would like to know from the minister exactly what it is that his department puts out by way of directives to systems about the teaching of and the handling of—which is perhaps more important, rather than simply teaching—the general handling of the whole drug scene, how you begin to deal with it and at what levels you start to cope with it, how we can integrate it into the entire school system so that it isn't something that's isolated off but rather it's something that's handled and taught on a day-to-day basis.

I am quite concerned that we have maybe inadvertently dragged some young people into it by bringing in these expert teachers who raise the whole topic and raise it sometimes unmeaningly in a way that perhaps makes it more attractive than it does make it anything else. They don't point out all of the dangers and don't have the time, nor do they have the relationship with the individual child in every class, to be able to handle it in a more personal way. I wonder if the minister would be able to tell me something about it and perhaps we could discuss it after that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, in the context of the teacher education area which we are discussing now, what we do is we have a person on staff at all of the teachers' colleges who is more than just generally knowledgeable in this particular area. Most of them have taken the special summer course that the Addiction Research Foundation gives.

They have taken some training in this particular area and these people are teaching the teachers who go out into the schools. This is the approach they are using. In this process they are using resource people, bringing them in, and trying to give to the teachers a basic grounding in the whole area of drug and alcohol abuse.

These teachers themselves will be able to work this into their courses. Basically we are talking about elementary school people. They will be able to work this into the general things they are teaching in the schools from day to day.

Mr. Deans: I am pleased about that but what bothers me is this. The drug thing is a fairly new thing. I am not going to quantify that by saying how many years old it is but it is comparatively new. We have a great many teachers in the system who were there long before drugs and solvents became a problem and they find it difficult, I am sure. I am not trying to downgrade them in any way—I am sure they find it difficult to teach about something of which they themselves have no direct knowledge and which wasn't part of their background or teacher training in the years in which they were undergoing rather extensive training.

The whole programme is changing; the whole development in a social way has changed. I am wondering what the department is now doing to bring those teachers who have been in the system for a great many years up-to-date in the methods of coping with, and distribution of, and understanding of youngsters who have already entered the drug scene or the solvent abuse scene if you like—or who are on the verge—other than bringing in the expert person from the drug addiction centre and having him or her outline the programme to the child.

I believe that drugs and abuse of drugs and solvents has become a much greater problem than many people might believe. I think that it can only be handled by the teacher with the very personal relationship that a teacher gets over the years with children. I don't think it can be handled in a standoffish way, by coming in and simply outlining the programmes of other people.

I think many of the teachers would probably welcome some kind of refresher courses. I don't know whether it would be a summer school course; I am not too sure. In some instances it wouldn't even be a refresher course, it would be completely new. It would be some kind of programme that they could go to which would bring them up to date on the handling of and the best possible way of communicating with young people in this society who are doing the things that a number of young people—maybe not a large number—in this society are doing.

I wonder if he can tell me what is going on now by way of trying to communicate with those teachers? I am not nearly as concerned about the younger ones coming into the system as I am about some of the ones who have been in it for quite a while and haven't had any background in the field.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In this particular regard, Mr. Chairman, first of all there is a summer

course available. The Addiction Research Foundation works with a university; this year I believe it is being given at the University of Ottawa. This is the same one which our personnel attend and any teacher who wishes to attend is eligible to make application. I don't know the exact number that can attend but I understand it is there if they wish to attend it.

There are, of course, curriculum helps in the general health area which are sent to teachers and to schools. We have about 195 films available for schools. There are resource people in our regional offices who are happy to work with school boards and groups of teachers in this particular area. Circular 15, for instance, the cataloguing of Canadian resource material, outlines the Canadian material that is available in this particular area. This is combined with the work of the Addiction Research Foundation, the Council on Drug Abuse and other similar groups that have various resources available for the community.

Incidentally, I think that is one particularly interesting group, the Council on Drug Abuse; it has a part-time employee who puts on seminars in schools. I have heard there have been some very good results in the Metropolitan Toronto area. They do work, and this in turn helps the teacher.

Mr. Deans: May I suggest to the minister that he have his department contact the various universities throughout Ontario and the boards of education in large municipalities to see if they can't come up with a programme in a variety of centres across the province to upgrade the knowledge of the many teachers in the field.

For example, McMaster University in Hamilton, with the new medical complex and all of the other things in it, is ideally suited to run just such a programme during this year. They have the teachers' college right there, and during the course of the year, they could run a programme that would be available to the teachers already in the field in an ongoing way. The same thing could be done in Windsor, London perhaps, and a number of other centres.

We've put a lot of emphasis lately on drug abuse in society; every time you open a newspaper or turn on the radio or the television, you get a message about drug abuse, somewhere or other. But, for some reason or other, we are not up to that standard in the educational system yet.

Teaching has changed considerably; I recognize that. The responsibility of teachers today, in my opinion at least and I suspect in the opinion of many people, is considerably greater than it once was. They are more than simply teaching nowadays. They have become not only the educator, but the confessor, the social worker. They have taken on roles they were never intended to have, but they have done that because the remainder of society have abdicated responsibilities.

I want to say to the minister that if we are going to ask the teachers to take on those roles, then we are going to have to be prepared to provide them with all of the support mechanisms that the require.

Mr. Foulds: Bang on!

Mr. Deans: And that means taking over and retraining them to be able to cope with all of the changes that occur in society—not only to be able to change in curriculum terms, to bring things up to date and to talk about space exploration as opposed to motor vehicle transportation, but also to be able to deal with the everyday problems that are starting to develop out in society, the society from which the children they are supposed to be teaching are coming.

Drug and solvent abuse is one of the most difficult areas to discuss, because it takes a very personal relationship before any child will begin to respond. It isn't something that you can do by just wandering into the school and sitting down and picking any child at random and starting a conversation. That child has to have developed a respect and an admiration and the confidence in the individual who is talking to them.

I can't go into the school—nor, I suspect, can the minister or any other member of the Legislature, or other people out in society—and develop the very personal relationship with each child that is so necessary if we are going to come to grips with all of the things like solvent and drug abuse.

I think the teachers at this point are ill equipped to handle the problems, through no fault of their own. They are well equipped to handle the things that they were taught to handle when they were taught to teach. Unfortunately for many that's not yesterday or the day before, and not even in this generation's children, so we are really looking at people who are very competent, and who, if given the opportunity and perhaps a little incentive, would be quite prepared to involve themselves to the degree that they would be able to deal quite adequately with the individual problems of the

children with whom they develop this very personal relationship on an ongoing basis.

Since the education system is becoming the catchall for many of the social ills, or at least for many of the ways of dealing with the social ills, I would like to see us put all of the emphasis that we possibly can on providing the teacher with all of the help that the teacher needs to become the social worker, to become the confessor, as I said, and also to carry on the extremely valuable function of teaching the educational things. As I look at society, I can't help thinking that as we become more and more affluent as parents we gradually lose our contact with children. While we can spend more money on all kinds of things to provide for them, we are rapidly losing that very close relationship that parents and children have had from time to time.

I never did like to do homework, personally, but the kids used to come home with their homework and the parent would sit down—at least some parents would sit down—and would go over it with them to see just how they were doing and to try to help them. Now with the changes in the education system, many parents feel totally inadequate. They can't handle the changes, because they don't understand what it is the child is learning and, therefore, they don't have the same relationship in regard to the schoolwork. School is the very focus and focal point of a child's existence in his early years. The parent becomes estranged from the child and the teacher takes the parent's place.

With that happening, the teacher then has to take on additional responsibilities. One of those is to provide the kind of guidance in the areas, as I say, of solvent and drug abuse. I think that teachers haven't been given all of the opportunities that they ought to have in equipping themselves to deal with that problem. I would like to ask the minister for more emphasis in the teaching of teachers on making sure that, not only are the new ones up to date, but all of the ones who are presently in the system are up to date too, so that we don't have that great gap.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I think that certainly we want to place within the hands of teachers all the resources available they can possibly have to do these jobs, and I think that we are making great progress in this particular area. I think that we have to be very careful, though, that we don't believe that we can wash our hands of the problem by giving all the resources to teachers and hoping that they can solve the problem, because this just won't happen.

I might just say to my friend that, while we are all concerned about solvents and use of harder drugs among young people, this is really a very small percentage of what we might call the total area of abuse. The areas I think are of the gravest concern are alcohol and smoking. I think the school can only do a limited job here. It can present certain facts; but it became very clear to me when I was Minister of Health that a lot that the school was doing was being completely wiped out by, for instance, the kind of cigarette advertising that we allow in this country. I think that here is an area where we have a proven health hazard.

I think in the future you will almost be able statistically to say that if a person starts smoking at age 14 and smokes for the rest of his life he is going to have some kind of health problem, whether it be cancer or emphysema. Everybody says we should practice preventive health and yet here is an area where we do nothing. The school and the teachers can do something. They can make the students aware of the hazards but that has only a very limited effect. I see, and I know you see, more and more young people of 12, 13 and 14 walking around the streets and the shopping centres smoking.

The same thing is true with alcohol. Because of alcohol's general acceptance in our society, it's still the major chemical that is being abused by young people. I still find it very difficult to know exactly what the school and the individual teacher can do in this particular area. They can do certain things, they can teach the hazards, the problems of alcoholism, the disease that it does bring about; but it is pretty hard for them to overcome the patterns of our society that dictate that people will drink, so we are into a bit of a problem area here. All I am really trying to say is, we have to be careful that we don't think that by giving all the resources to the teachers we will solve our problem. I am sure my friend agrees with that.

Mr. Deans: All right. I won't quarrel with you about that. I'm just suggesting that the teachers themselves are handcuffed by the fact that they don't have the opportunity. You raise alcohol and smoking, though, as a problem. The problem there is the problem of double standards. That is the difficulty in alcohol and smoking. You say to a child, "You shall not drink and you shall not smoke" while you sit puffing away on a cigar and drinking a beer, and that is the problem.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I hope that you are using that "you" generally!

Mr. Deans: Well, I realize that you don't smoke cigars—

Hon. Mr. Wells: But I do. I do. I don't inhale them.

Mr. Deans: Okay, but this is what is wrong. This is what you are saying to the child, "It is not good for you but it is okay for me."

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. Deans: How do you teach him that thing? How do you say to a 15-year-old or a 16-year-old who is three or two years away from the legal drinking age, "Now look, alcohol is bad for you," when he knows darn fine that when you leave the school, if you are a teacher, chances are that—maybe not on your way home but certainly at some point—you drop by the local drinking establishment and you have a couple of beers?

Mr. Foulds: Especially on Friday afternoon.

Mr. Deans: And you're only 19 and you are teaching. I say to you that this is the whole problem. It is unreal. It is unreal because we don't believe it. Society doesn't believe that those things are doing harm, whether you believe what I am saying or not. Society doesn't believe it. And we are trying to teach people not to do things which we do ourselves, which in fact we don't think are doing us very much harm or we wouldn't be doing them. It is a little different proposition.

I understand the problem there, I understand the problem well. I don't know how you cope with that, because if you are going to turn around on the one hand and do it yourself and say to somebody else you shouldn't, then you've got a real problem. I am suggesting that we deal with drugs a little differently, because I hope I am right in saying that the majority of adults do not engage in the whole drug scene. They don't get involved in that. I hope I am right in that. I think I am right.

Therefore, when they are saying that you ought not to do it, it is not as though they are setting up this double standard. They're saying you shouldn't do it and not only should you not do it we don't do it either, because it is bad for us. Whether it be bad for you in terms of your physical health or your mental health I am not about to argue, but nevertheless, it doesn't do you any good. I think the reason we are not successful in the education in alcohol and smoking is an entirely different matter. I don't see how you can teach it if you don't believe, and I don't think half the people who are trying to teach it believe it.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 carried?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I just want to say, so that the record is straight, I think the opposite to you. I think to some degree anyway—and the Addiction Research Foundation makes this point—that you can't separate alcohol and smoking from drug abuse, that there is an interrelationship and that is part of the problem. Some of the young people will reject alcohol and they say—you know the stories—

Mr. Deans: No, I understand, I think they are off base on that.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Item 6 carry?

Mr. Foulds: Of course not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, item 6. There are a couple of areas in teacher training that concern me. The first are rather mechanical and perhaps I could ask the minister to respond as I ask the questions. Do we know how many graduates there were of teacher training colleges or institutions this year? And if so, do we have any idea how many found employment in the teaching profession?

Hon. Mr. Wells: You are talking about last year, aren't you?

Mr. Foulds: This year.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You mean this year?

Mr. Foulds: If you have last year's figures there I would not mind those either. This year's are the ones that particularly worry me.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The enrolment for Hamilton Teachers' College—I have got some more-up-to-date figures here; that is what I am trying to check. I am trying to relate the two, the number hired and the enrolment. The enrolment for Hamilton Teachers' College is 324; hired for next September is 30 per cent of that total. This is as of today.

London, 316, 40 per cent hired; North Bay, 145, 10 per cent have jobs; Ottawa, 231, 40 per cent; Peterborough, 124, 50 per cent; Stratford, 162, 48 per cent; Sudbury,

190, 55 to 60 per cent; Toronto, 928, 43 per cent.

Also in these groups, at Hamilton 61 per cent of those in the primary school specialist programme have been hired. In Ottawa, 30 per cent and in Toronto 76.4 per cent of the primary specialists.

Mr. Foulds: But those are not all the teachers' colleges in the province.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They are the ones under our ministry. Do you want the affiliated universities? Do you want secondary too?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, please. If they are available.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Althouse College of Education, enrolment 752, 11 per cent hired. The figures I am giving you now are as of May 24, 1972; the ones I just gave you were brought up to date as of today. Brock College of Education had an enrolment of 109, 22 per cent have been hired. Lakehead Faculty of Education, elementary enrolment, 98, 36 per cent have been hired; secondary enrolment, 202, 20 per cent of those have been hired; McArthur College of Education, 638, 30 per cent have been hired; Ottawa Faculty of Education, elementary enrolment 180, 37 percent have been hired; secondary enrolment, 106, 67 per cent have been hired; Toronto College of Education, secondary enrolment 1,238, 48 per cent have been hired; Windsor Faculty of Education, 162, 16 per cent have been hired; York Faculty of Education, enrolment 450, 32 per cent have been hired:

The last figures I gave you were to May 24, 1972, and a lot of boards hadn't really started to recruit. May 31 is the magic date and there seemed to be developing this year more than ever before a pattern of boards waiting until after the 31st. They wanted to see exactly what the situation was; who was, in fact, retiring; what positions would be available and the full range of people they had available.

As far as I can gather, last year—I haven't got the breakdown for all the institutions—there were about 207 secondary school teachers who didn't obtain employment; about 80 per cent of those graduating got positions. In the elementary panel there were about 2,006 teachers without positions. That means 60 to 65 per cent of those who graduated got positions last year. This was last summer.

Mr. Foulds: I don't want to belabour the point but even considering the circumstances, the figures seem to me to be rather disastrous in terms of employment of the people who were graduating from teachers' colleges.

I know you can make the argument, and make it with some validity, that even if the student does not get a job this year, in coming years he'll have that skill and if something opens up, he can then get the job. But unless he gets a job within two or three years of graduation, the particular skills and techniques that he has learned have already become outdated to some extent, because he hasn't been directly connected to the teaching profession. He hasn't had a direct contact to be conscious of some of the new developments in the methodology and techniques of teaching.

I think you said only 16 per cent obtain employment in Windsor. That seems to me to be a particularly unhealthy situation. I understand, and I could be corrected here, that there is no plan by the department to curtail enrolment in the teachers' colleges, or teacher training institutions in the province.

It seems to me that we're falling into a very real trap here. We go to the expense of providing all the training facilities; the masters at the teachers' colleges for the student teacher; and we erect a system of associate teachers. I don't know what the mean average would be of the figures you gave me, even considering the last set was May 24; and let's say they even rose another 20 per cent—which I suppose would be somewhat optimistic. But even doing so, I don't think I'm out of line saying that 50 per cent or less of the total graduates of teachers' colleges will find employment.

And that seems to me to lead to two kinds of frustration. There is the frustration of the individual who does not get a job; and the frustration of the individual who remains in teaching, but knows that he's overworked. Now there are many teachers I know that don't do an adequate job; just as it is in any profession. There are lawyers who don't do adequate jobs; there are politicians who don't do adequate jobs; and there are some among dentists.

There's a range of competence going from poor to excellent in every profession. I don't think that teaching is out of line with that normal range. It depends on individual teachers and their inclination and dedication to the profession. I've seen teachers perform 300 days a year, 12 hours a day; I've seen others perform less than 200 days at 5½ hours a day.

But it seems to me that there is the frustration in the system of the teacher who is overworked; and there is the frustration within the system experienced by the student who doesn't get the adequate attention because the pupil-teacher ratio, for all the factors, is still relatively high. That is the true pupil-teacher ratio; the experience that the kid has in the classroom.

Surely to goodness, one of the areas that we can start emphasizing is the classroom. Perhaps we should start getting more administrators who have had teaching experience and who are now administering in the various aspects of the educational industry back into the classroom occasionally so that they would know what is going on there.

I think that one of the areas I would like to talk about is teacher education in the province. I have a feeling that we haven't really thought out the programmes that amalgamated some of the teachers' colleges with the universities—three or four have developed university programmes, I believe—but as I understand it, there is a report coming in in four or five weeks. I understand that that will probably be making recommendations with regard to—what is it?—five or six colleges which aren't associated with universities and in what direction that will be going.

I would hope that it would also—and you can clarify this in your reply to me, Mr. Minister—be taking a genuine look at the content and the course delineation in teacher training. I know a number of university graduates—I was initially one myself—who on first encountering the teacher-training system experienced a good deal of frustration, because the system was, for the lack of a better word, Mickey Mouse. You got engaged in a lot of the very essential mechanics, but that seemed to be as far as it was heading.

I don't know whether I was fortunate or not. I think I was, because the teacher training that I took, I took during summer courses, and particularly in my own field.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): It's shorter that way.

Mr. Foulds: It was shorter but in some ways it was more stimulating, I think. But in my own field, I happened to be fortunate enough in the teacher training that I have two—in subsequent years, three—excellent people who were devoted to the idea of teaching.

I think that is one of the things that, without getting sloppy or sentimental, or overly idealistic in an "Up the Down Staircase" kind of way, we have to consider when we are talking about teacher education. After all, the exchange of ideas is probably the most delicate operation that takes place in human behaviour. The actual conveying of a new concept to another individual and the grasping of that concept by that other individual is perhaps one of the most magic moments that takes place in the whole realm of human activities.

It seems to me that that does not happen very often; and that's understandable when you get into a kind of factory system. For all its faults the factory system has some value, but when you get into it to the exclusion of the interchange of ideas of concept, you are, in many ways, endangering the whole educational process.

I'm afraid occasionally—and this is, as I indicated in my earlier remarks, when I get anarchistic about the school system—the system itself prevents that real interchange of ideas, the kind of teaching that Bertrand Russell said could only take place for, at the most, three hours a week. But when the system actually inhibits us, I think we are in very real trouble and I have a suspicion that all the activities that go on in the teachers' colleges do not emphasize that kind of teaching and that kind of learning enough.

I suppose it takes a very special gift to be able to do that; it also takes a good deal of knowledge of human behaviour and human perception patterns. But it is the kind of thing that I think we should encourage in our teachers' colleges and our teacher training institutions.

There is another area of teacher education that I think we don't pursue nearly actively enough, and we probably don't pursue it merely because its importance has not really hit us as administrators, politicians, or taxpayers. It is not the mere retraining or upgrading of teachers through additional courses, necessary and valuable as that may be, but that is the restimulation of teachers.

Somehow we have to encourage our system to encourage teachers to do some thinking, to do some reading, to ingest ideas. It is not enough that they are going on the material they learned at university; coincidentally they must be reading not merely in the theory of teaching in their own subject areas, but they must be reading in a number of areas. Because what I was talking about earlier, that interchange of ideas, that magic moment of real communication so that for the first time a human being perceives a concept, that takes

a flash of inspiration. And that inspiration only comes to and from a person because of a background, a well of consciousness that he has—not as a result of a deliberately built-up mechanistic accumulation of credits.

It seems to me that the so-called professional development days of teachers by and large have not been very successful in this respect, because the professional development day by its very nature has been a mechanistic day. Occasionally it's been worthwhile. I have attended one or two that I have actually found stimulating—one or two out of 13, I think. And, you know, what the heck, that's not bad.

But I think we who are concerned with education have to really think about this restimulation, and that's what I call the genuine professional development of teachers. I think this is probably the single most vital area if our educational system is to maintain a vitality and a life, and not merely be a system that is continuing to go on the mechanics of its structure.

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I got a little more wound up there than I intended to when I opened with my remarks, and I hope the earlier questions I put to the minister haven't been forgotten.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Very useful indeed.

Mr. Laughren: It gives the minister a philosophic base.

Mr. Stokes: A whole new dimension.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 carried?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I was going to say that one of the things we are working toward—and when we present this further master plan on teacher education for the province, which is a continuation of what has been going on, it will sort of outline our policies—one of the things that we certainly intend to institute is a system of evaluation of the faculties of education. The proposal that we are now considering is a cyclical review that will be done by a committee made up of people from the ministry, the teachers' federation, trustees, and the university. The public at large also should be involved in this. This group will evaluate the various teaching institutions and report to us, so that we will know, when we are certifying the graduates of these institutions, they are coming from a programme with which we are satisfied with.

I think that this is going to have to be very, very important. Certainly when we in the ministry certify the graduates of these programmes we want to be assured that they are coming from relevant, good and, in fact, excellent programmes.

As the programmes pass out into the universities they become more autonomous. So, through this evaluation and accreditation mechanism, we believe this is the way that we will be assured that the teachers that are certified in this province are indeed going to have the potential that we feel they should have. I certainly couldn't differ with the hon. member in some of the latter part of his comments about a good teacher and what has to be developed in one. I think that we all would certainly believe that this is something that should be sought. A report that has just been issued by Lord James, I think, puts great emphasis on this same sort of thought.

I might just say, though, in answer to his first remarks that at this point in time, we feel that there should be no arbitrary restrictions on numbers attending our teachers' colleges or the faculties of education. My personal opinion is that the employment facts should be very clearly outlined to young people who are thinking of entering these educational institutions. Having done that, I think that if they still wish to attend and take this course, we have an obligation to provide it for them. I say that within the general guidelines, as I indicated earlier, that we have in our department and in Colleges and Universities on the number of students that can be handled. Apart from that, our feeling at this point in time is that, having made them aware of the potential job situation, if they wish to attend they may do so.

There are certain things that are going to have an affect on enrolments. Enrolment in elementary school teacher training institutions is down 44 per cent this year from last year. This year fees will be charged at those institutions, to put them on a par with all other post-secondary educational institutions. A year from now, a person entering teachers' college will have to have a BA degree. This in itself will present further requirements for entrants which haven't been demanded before.

One of the things that really strikes me and that I found rather disturbing and I think that we are getting away from—in fact, I know we are getting away from it—is that in the past when we had such high enrolments, particularly elementary teacher training institutions, the choice of being a teacher was a fifth or sixth choice of someone. They tried

everything else and they couldn't get into anything else. It didn't cost anything to go to teachers' college; so they ended up there. In this day and age—

Mr. Foulds: Funnily enough, some of them made good teachers.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's right. They did; and that just disproves the kind of argument that we are trying to make. What we are saying now is that they will still have the opportunity. There will be no artificial or arbitrarily set limits, as there are, for instance, for law and medicine and various professions such as these in this province; but they will have to make that decision themselves and make up their minds if they want to go, given the job outlook that they see before them.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 carried?

Mr. B. Newman: I wanted to ask the minister if he is considering the transferral of college of education curricula into the universities, so that teacher training would be all in the universities, rather than be in two different areas in the college of education for secondary school teachers and in the universities for elementary school teachers?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are actually working to switch this over. What we want is to have each faculty train a broad range of teachers. Our ultimate plan in the future is not to have, for instance, Toronto College of Education training exclusively secondary school teachers. They will train teachers and there will be breakdowns within that faculty.

Mr. B. Newman: Do you intend eventually to phase out the colleges of education and have them simply at the universities and not called colleges of education? It would simply be the faculty of education at, say, the University of Windsor, University of Western Ontario, Queen's University and so forth?

Hon. Mr. Wells: How they end up being named within the universities will be up to the universities themselves. They can stay as a college of education or faculty of education. Universities have their own preferences and they have their own ranking of the various schools, colleges and faculties within their whole ambit. They will decide that.

Mr. Foulds: Will they go back to the Ministry of Education?

Mr. B. Newman: What I am trying to get at is that graduates of, say, the University of Windsor would no longer have to take a post-graduate year at Althouse or some other place. They could take it right at the University of Windsor then, is that the idea?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Eventually we hope Windsor will give both elementary and secondary certification.

Mr. B. Newman: And other universities likewise?

Hon. Mr. Wells: And others.

Mr. B. Newman: Right.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 6 carried?

Mr. Foulds: I'd like to raise a question with the minister in view of the last part of his remarks in which he indicated that there was 44 per cent less enrolment in the elementary school panel of the teacher training programme. I know that it may be premature but in view of this I would imagine that a number of teachers from those institutions are also finding themselves out of jobs. Is the staff dropping in the teacher training institutions? Are any of the institutions being considered for phasing out simply because of an overabundance of places?

Mr. Laughren: Tell us about the teacher-pupil ratio at Brock.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Actually some of the staff have been borrowed for use in other capacities. What has happened—I am sorry. I misunderstood.

Actually we had certain staff in some of the teachers' colleges that had been borrowed from the local school system. When enrolments dropped they were phased back into the local school from where they—

Mr. Foulds: So then they were teaching and many graduate teachers didn't have jobs because their masters took them instead?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I suppose I don't know for sure. What did happen, of course, is that the pupil-teacher ratio in the teachers' colleges came down to a level closer to that which is found in the faculties of education and the university educational institutions.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 6 carried? Is Item 7 carried? If it is not carried we will adjourn. No, it is not carried. You wanted to speak on item 7, didn't you?

Mr. Foulds: Just one brief question.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Ask it; go ahead.

Mr. Foulds: Is the department considering the implications of the Wright commission report with regard to redrafting, redirecting the correspondence courses? The implication that education will be an entirely ongoing process and the open university concept is one of the things that I am trying to drive at. It may not be such a brief question after all.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can't tell you exactly now but we would be happy from our point of view to sit down with the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Kerr). If this operation can be expanded as part of something even more useful and better, such as an open university which spans the whole education ambit, that would be fine. We have here, I guess we can say, the largest school in Ontario. I think there are about 50,000 students taking correspondence courses through our programme. It is really I guess quite a successful operation. As you may know, it isn't advertised, it is just there. If we advertised it, perhaps we would have 75,000. I haven't had a chance to look at every part of this ministry yet, and there may be a few things that we can do with the correspondence course to make it even more relevant and helpful to the people in the province.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2202 carried?

Vote 2202 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR:

GOOD SAMARITAN ACT

Mr. Haggerty moves second reading of Bill 122, An Act to relieve Persons from Liability in respect of Voluntary Emergency Medical and First Aid Services.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker the purpose of the bill is to relieve persons from liability in respect to voluntary emergency first aid assistance, the medical services granted at or near the scene of an accident or other sudden emergency.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Carried!

Mr. Haggerty: The Bible is recognized as the great source book of character. So true to human life and character are its teachings that nearly every one illustrates not a single trait of character but many; for so it is in actual experience, one quality merges imperceptibly into another, a single act is often a cross section of a complete character.

The Dutch artist Rembrandt, 1606 to 1669, one of the world's greatest, revealed his penetrating understanding of human emotion and provided us with a great artist's interpretation of this beautiful lesson in the spirit of compassion. It can be found in the good book, St. Luke 11, chapter 10, verses 30 to 37. It is one of the Bible's oldest parables.

A man falls among thieves on the road to Jericho and was beaten almost to death. It was a well-travelled road. Perhaps the methods of travel were different than our present mechanical methods of this day. There were many travellers, some important persons. A priest came along going to take his part in the temple worship in Jerusalem, and seeing the injured man lying in the road, refused to assist in first aid treatment. He simply did not want to get involved. There were others who passed by, just looked and continued on their way; people who could not spare a moment of their time.

Mr. Speaker, how often have we heard these same remarks in our present day life, "I haven't the time, nor do I want to become involved"? Needless to say there are a great number of injured persons, victims of highway accidents, who are treated in the same manner and left to suffer and die. It was so then until a Samaritan came upon the injured traveller, stopped and paused for a moment; then took the wounded man in his arms, bound up his bleeding wounds and removed the injured traveller to an inn where further care was provided.

That great teacher of righteousness summed it up in four words: "Go and do likewise." Forget about your own personal hate, distrust and dislike for others; but help those that need care. Thank God we have some dedicated people who believe in following those same principles of some 2,000 years ago; people who want to help the injured regardless of any emergency in which they are called upon to act.

The saving of life is a serious matter in itself and it should be handled with all pos-

sible care. We in this province have one of the best ambulance services available and much credit can be given to Dr. McNally for his leadership.

We also have in Ontario many persons who have received certificates in first aid treatment courses. The average course runs about 25 to 30 hours. There have been large groups which have successfully been given credits in first aid treatment and rescue courses in many industries. One of the most important lessons taught before becoming a full-fledged Boy Scout was to qualify in first aid treatment, if I can recall my days as a Boy Scout.

The St. John Ambulance service perhaps is one of the oldest of the first aid services, which has been passed down through the long years in history. I think it goes back centuries to the time when first aid services were provided for Crusaders heading into or in the Holy Land.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to single out one or two organizations in the province that I believe are of the greatest in character; and they are the volunteer and paid firemen. This group of dedicated persons are the province's greatest source of emergency aid facilities; they are available at all times and are called upon first in any emergency, accident or rescue. Their services are required by many citizens of this province; and perhaps I should also include the policemen in this regard.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I have overemphasized persons who are involved in emergency first aid. Yes, we do have the assistance of medical doctors and registered health nurses available for all emergency calls; but in many instances not readily available for emergency care at the scene of an accident. I have noticed in the past few years that few doctors are at the scene of an accident; perhaps one reason being that the doctor is too busy with his heavy workload. I believe an average weekly work period for a doctor in Ontario is 65 hours; and possibly it goes as high as 100 hours. This does not allow him too much freedom to attend the many accidents on our highways, or any other emergency; thus leaving many accident victims with little, if any, medical or first-aid treatment. The injured suffer and die.

The latest figures on traffic accidents that I have been able to obtain for the Province of Ontario are for the year 1970. There were 1,300 fatal accidents and 50,372 personal injury accidents. Other Ontario accidents included 15 fatal gun accidents and 67 non-fatal gun injuries in 1971. Also there were 88 boat fatalities and 300 persons who drowned.

There were 34 serious snowmobile accidents and no doubt some of those fatally injured might have been living today if first aid or medical treatment had been received at the time immediately following the accident. But none was given for various reasons. It was either unavailable because no one would administer first aid, or some travelling motorist just stopped to look around and did nothing; or didn't want to become involved. Many persons at an accident have had some first aid training—whether it be through Boy Scouts, or as a fireman or police officer—and yet they hesitate to get involved. Perhaps it is because of the fear of moving an injured person, and the question of ensuing legal difficulties.

There are many accident victims who cannot survive a short period of time without care. These include traumatic injuries, haemorrhage, or massive destruction of tissue. In the second class are non-traumatic injuries; emergencies such as heart attacks, respiratory failure and acute poisoning.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall an accident a short distance from my home where a person was seriously, or critically injured. Presently a doctor was at the scene, but he would not get involved for fear of ensuing legal action. The doctor stood by and could do very little. I asked him: "Why don't you at least apply first aid to him?" He said: "If I touch him, I am liable to have a civil action taken against me."

Perhaps one of the reasons was he happened to be an American doctor; he had a family home in the area and lived there for six months of the year but he would not touch him.

Last summer I was working around my place and I happened to hear a train blow, and then all of a sudden a large bang and a big thud. I looked over about a mile from my place and there was a big cloud of smoke. I said to my neighbour: "That sounded like that train exploded." We took off immediately to the area and upon arriving there was a train, with three diesel engines and about 22 cars that were wedged together, almost like an accordian.

As we came upon the scene there was a youngster lying on the side of the road, almost in the ditch, and there was water there. The youngster was picked up by some persons close by, put onto the grass and stretched out and covered up with a blanket. The

call went in for the ambulance service and a doctor.

The ambulance came in a matter of about 10 minutes later. There was no doctor. I had in the meantime called the fire department, because I went up and looked at the engine and there was one of the trainmen wedged in the engine, in the forward engine and trapped in there. I presume that perhaps if proper emergency care or treatment had been applied at the time he might have been living today, but that was not the case.

When the ambulance driver arrived there were four other persons that were injured. One person had a severely damaged leg and was in shock.

I rather sympathized with the ambulance driver. He was the only one there, but he had four persons to look after, four injured persons, and of course when you are involved with a train accident or an automobile accident, there may be a spread of about 800 to 900 ft. between one victim and another victim. He was running up and down both side of the wreck trying to get to the people to give them immediate first aid.

As I looked about, there were a number of persons that were there, I noticed there were a couple of nurses in the group. Again, they sat idly by and did nothing. Upon further questioning of other persons regarding their involvement in emergency care treatment, I found that nurses, even, will not administer first aid in any emergency along a highway or at the scene of an accident.

And this is one of the reasons why, they are afraid; fear of a civil action or court action. They could be sued.

I checked into this further and I find that this happens in many cases in the Province of Ontario. Where accidents occur persons that could apply first aid stand idly by doing nothing. As I mentioned before, I give much credit to the volunteer fire department, or paid fire department, because they are one of the first ones that are called and they don't seem to hesitate to move in and administer first aid.

Still there is the question with regard to these persons, whether there could be a civil action laid against the volunteer firemen. In fact, those that are employed in industry, those who are trained by many companies in the matter of first aid treatment and rescue, there is a possibility that these persons could be charged in a civil action taken later on in the case of a death or something in any accident.

On all these questions of fear of civil action, the point and the purpose of this bill is to relieve that fear. There are a number of qualified persons and professional people available in the province who will not provide first aid and emergency care at the scene of an accident. There is always this same fear that applies to the professional group.

In my discussions with the volunteer fire departments, particularly in my riding, I talked over the matter with a deputy chief of Fort Erie Co. No. 3, Stan Learn. He brought this to my attention and asked me if something couldn't be done here at Queen's Park; if perhaps there shouldn't be some legislation similar to that in the United States. The Good Samaritan Act, I believe, is in effect in 39 states in the United States and it has provided a very effective emergency care treatment programme there.

I had the pleasure of discussing this matter with Mr. Richard Stol, EMT, Educational Co-ordinator at Empire State Rescue and First Aid Association Inc. who has been a strong promoter of the Good Samaritan Act in New York State. Through his efforts New York State now has it in force.

If you happen to live in a community bordering the United States, such as the town of Fort Erie next to the city of Buffalo where they have good neighbour relations; in any emergency regardless of whether it deals with fire calls or fire emergency equipment, the city of Buffalo will send equipment over to Fort Erie and Fort Erie will send emergency equipment over to the city of Buffalo for any emergency there. So we do have a good neighbour policy there.

I imagine it would follow in any other border city, particularly perhaps in Niagara Falls, Ont., which has a reciprocal agreement with the city of Niagara Falls, New York State, for all emergency calls.

So I think they have an exceptionally good plan over there. I would like to see it implemented here in the Province of Ontario. Perhaps the bill doesn't meet with the approval of everyone, but I think the intent is there. The intent and the purpose of the bill is to relieve persons from liability in respect of voluntary emergency first aid assistance or medical services rendered at or near the scene of an accident or other sudden emergency.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to sit back and listen to the other speakers who are going to follow me. I can

only assume, but I'm sure that they will endorse this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London North.

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Good Samaritan Act, if I may call it that—An Act to relieve persons from liability in respect to voluntary emergency medical and first aid services.

In principle I agree entirely with it and I feel that it is a step in the right direction—although I have some reservations, as a number of us will have, with respect to some of the definitions, particularly paragraph 2 where the bill indicates in the last two lines that, "a wilful or wanton misconduct" on the part of the person incurring the possibility of a negligent suit will be deemed inappropriate. I think that this is probably inappropriate and should probably relate to a gross negligence or something in that order, rather than wanton or wilful misconduct which in itself may be deemed somewhat of a misdemeanor.

Mr. Speaker, the Criminal Code of Canada in the old Act—I don't have the up-to-date amendment in the book that I have in front of me—but section 221-2 requires that the driver of a motor vehicle, when involved in a motor vehicle accident, must stop and render assistance to injured victims. Now if that particular driver turns out to be a medical doctor driving the car, and if he were obliged by the Criminal Code to stop and render assistance under penalty of two years in jail, and then by rendering such assistance were to find himself open to a negligence suit, I think that we find ourselves in a rather ridiculous situation.

If the present law as is stands with respect to negligence acts as a deterrent to the proper course of moral conduct by doctors and nurses, and in fact others—in fact I sometimes think this should be extended to lawyers who render their quick legal aid service at the clinics every Friday night like myself—but in case—

Mr. Singer: Or to their friends who don't give retainers.

Mr. Walker: That's right. Quick sue; that's the answer!

If it acts as a deterrent, certainly this type of law must be brought into check.

Now we ask ourselves how does this law come about, and I think with respect to Ontario it's not so much a problem. I don't think that really, in this province, our courts could come to a conclusion that a person who has rendered emergency medical aid would be negligent.

However, to our misfortune the *bête noire* here is the state of California, that great negligence capital of the world. Unlike Ontario, in California, where you have the $1 million lawsuits, if someone gets hit by a bicycle he can expect to launch a whiplash action and recover something in the range of $25,000 or $35,000 for it.

However, that is not the case in Ontario. But that California hysteria, that mania, has spread throughout Canada. In fact I believe that it operates on a number of doctors who happen to be passing by the scene of an accident. The hysteria really is preached in the medical schools in California; this warning is given to every potential practitioner in the medical schools. He is told not to stop at the scene of an accident for fear of a negligence suit. Let the person call the ambulance and let the ambulance take him to the hospital where his doctor can properly administer to his recovery.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Is that in Canada or in the United States?

Mr. Walker: That is the United States, in California.

Mr. Deacon: The hon. member said in Canada.

Mr. Walker: Well, I would like to correct that and make clear that it is in the state of California where it is indicated that a person should not stop.

In Canada it may not be so much taught that way, however the parable is told and the doctors are given more than a light warning. I have a very good acquaintance who is a medical practitioner in London, Dr. Collyer, who has indicated to me that when he attended one of the medical schools, about 15 years ago, this story was told; the parable was there and he was to draw his own conclusions.

He states that whenever he comes upon this type of situation he has to think twice whether or not he will stop. He assures me, however, that his moral suasion is proper here and that he stops and does render first aid. Perhaps he is endangering himself to a civil action; but nevertheless his moral duty weighs out, and I think this quality is to be commended.

The story that is often told in California is about the accident victim who was found by a doctor, found in a dark, dank ditch, suffering from some type of severed artery in his arm. The artery was bleeding so profusely that the man would have bled to death within a reasonable amount of time. This occurred some 15 or 20 years ago.

Apparently the doctor administered first aid. He used a heamostat, which is a type of clamp and crushed the end of the artery which was sufficient to stop the blood from running out. It was dark, it was late at night —very, very poor operating conditions, to say the least. The doctor applied the clamp and apparently pinched a nerve, thereby causing a permanent disability.

Therefore, in spite of the fact that he saved this man's life, the doctor was open to a negligence suit. In fact, the then victim, now at least alive, was able to bring an action and was successful in the California superior courts in recovering some amount of money for the neegligence of this doctor. The superior court in California indicated at the time that this doctor was expected to give the same standard of care in the dirty dark ditch as he did on the clean, sterile, floodlit operating table.

This is a ridiculous situation. Unfortunately that law has made its inroads into Canada and I suppose we have to ask ourselves just how much this is prevalent.

Very often a doctor, or nurse or some other person is called out of an audience; I think that all of us could probably recall a dozen times when we have heard over the public address system, "Is there a doctor here?" Or, "Would a doctor please come backstage?" Or something of that sort. That is an emergency situation which I feel falls well within what this bill has attempted to frame.

The unfortunate circumstance is that some doctors would probably sit back and be worried about the possibility of a negligence suit in performing some type of emergency action behind the stage curtain, or wherever it might be. This is terrible if our common law is such as to cause our medical people and other people to pass on by—to not save life when it is very important that everyone attend to this type of duty.

This "pass-on-by" attitude we have seen in the state of New York, where citizens have stood and watched victims be victimized by thugs—or even killed, raped, what have you and yet their intervention would have prevented that type of injury. They've stood by, and we have all thought that that was terribly repugnant. If our laws are such that they cause this type of repugnant thing to be introduced into Canada then we must take all necessary steps to correct the matter. It is my considered opinion that the bill deserves, certainly in principle, all the support that this Legislature can give it; although there are a few small amendments that I would think might well be made.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure for me to rise and support Bill 122. I want to approach it from a slightly different perspective than the two previous speakers, notwithstanding the fact that I agree with most of what they have said. In researching something for this bill, the one article that impressed me most was an essay written by Anthony M. Honoré of the United States in which he discusses the shared morality of society. And he asks:

> Is there in modern industrial society, which is the only one most of us know, a shared attitude of praise or condemnation, encouragement or dissuasion about helping those in peril? If so, should the law with its mechanisms be used to encourage what the shared morality treats as laudable and discourage what it reprobates? Should the law go further and by the use of threats and penalities enforce morality?
>
> Is it justifiable to use the mechanism of criminal law to enforce the shared morality in matters of sex? Some people feel that the intrusion of the law into the private sphere of sex is indecent and outrageous. Others feel outraged by the failure of the law to intrude in relation to victim and practitioner. Is the refusal to enforce the moral obligation to help others itself a moral offence of which lawyers and legislators have been guilty in this English-speaking world for 100 years?
>
> Does the affront of this refusal bring the law and lawyers into disrepute? Should the law encourage, or even insist on, do-goodery?
>
> An essential preliminary to the survey of the larger vistas of law and morals is to clear our minds about our moral views in the matter of aid to those in peril.

By our moral views Honoré, my source of information, means the shared or common morality. This is obviously not the same as the statement of what people actually do in

a given society, the common practice of mankind. Their actions may fall short of their moral ideals and pretensions. Nor is it the same as that which an individual may accept for himself as morally obligatory.

The shared morality consists rather of those ideals and duties or obligations which the bulk of the community regard as applying to persons generally. It must be an open question whether people who share moral ideals also think that these should be mirrored in the law. If they do, decisions must be reached with the aid of such information and intuition as we may possess, lest we shirk the question of what our shared morality says about patient and practitioner.

In this we must differentiate between moral ideals and moral duties. A person may accept as an obligation for himself what he thinks of merely as an ideal for others. Broadly speaking, moral ideals concern patterns of conduct which are admired but not required. Moral duties on the other hand, concern conduct which is required but not admired.

Certain virtues, notably altruism and generosity, depend on an absence of obligation. It is not altruistic to pay one's debts or to support one's parents. Other virtues seem to hover between the status of ideals and duty. Is this true of the neighbourliness which the parable of the good Samaritan is meant both to illustrate and to inculcate?

According to Matthew and Mark the precept, "love your neighbour as yourself," expresses a commandment and presumably imposes an obligation. Luke, in contrast, treats it as pointing the way to perfection or eternal life, a moral ideal.

There are four types of rescuer and non-rescuer to contend with in these situations. The first is the priest or the Levite who passes by on the other side. The second is the man who does no more than he is bound to do, whether his duty arises from his profession or from a special link with the person in peril or from common humanity. The third is he who in doing his duty exposes himself to a risk; he is possibly a hero. The fourth is the true volunteer, altruistically exposing himself to danger to help those to whom he is bound by no special tie; perhaps also a hero.

Should the law encourage or discourage the rescuer?

There is no neutrality. If the law does not encourage rescue, it is sure to discourage it. If it does not compensate, it will indirectly penalize. If it does not relieve from liability those that would help, it condones non-involvement. The law cannot stay out of the fight; and if it cannot, there is surely a strong case for relieving the rescuer. To do so will be in the interests of those who might be saved.

The community applauds the good Samaritan; so the law, if it encourages rescue, is helping to satisfy the interests of the individuals and the wants of the community.

The means available to do this are essentially the relieving of the rescuer from liability. If the state is to compensate the victims of crimes of violence, as is now done in Ontario, why not compensate the equal heroism of those who suffer injury in effecting rescues or a doctor administering to the victims of the road?

Since the purpose of this bill is to relieve persons from liability in respect of voluntary emergency first aid assistance or medical services rendered at or near the scene of an accident or other sudden emergency, is it not essential through its statutory law and administrative practice at the very least for society to say to the potential good Samaritan that even though we may not compel you to assist your fellow citizen, if your sense of human identity with your fellow citizen, of brotherhood, is such that you do assist him, you should not suffer as a result of your good intentions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to lend my support to this bill; and I hope that other members will do likewise.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I too rise to support this bill introduced by my colleague from Welland South. I am pleased that he has brought it in the form of private members' bill but I regret that the government has not seen fit long ago to present this as government legislation.

It is a concern that has been expressed by Professor Allen Linden before the law reform commission many years ago, in 1965 I believe. In almost each year since that time the member for Downsview has been pressing the government to take action to correct this deficiency in our present legislation. As the member for Thunder Bay just mentioned, it is very important that there be complete freedom on the part of ordinary people who want to help their fellow man to take action to so help them.

It is very important that as many of us as possible get some training in first aid, so we recognize when we are really helping and when we could be harming.

The Boy Scout movement, as my colleague from Welland South said, is one that is doing that. So is the Red Cross organization. Of course the outstanding one is the St. John Ambulance, which has a very widespread programme. The hours of dedicated service contributed by them are beyond comprehension. I think the average cost of the St. John Ambulance to the public—and that is almost all contributed in the form of charitable donations—is something like 45 cents an hour in providing the service it does, which we know is offered at any major public function. The St. John Ambulance brigade has earned worldwide distinction in the manner in which it has served the public.

A second area in which I am pleased to see great improvement in training people to look after their fellow men when they see them in difficulties or emergency situations such as we have heard about from my colleague from Welland South, is in the training of police and firemen, and in recent years more so than ever before in the ambulance service.

As our colleague mentioned, Dr. McNally has done an outstanding job in raising the status of ambulance operators to not just one of being drivers, as they formerly were, but to being ambulance attendants. And attendant implies and actually means that these people are well qualified to provide first aid in a way and of a standard that we have never had until recent years.

I think that separating the ambulance service from being directly under the hospital administration where they were looked upon as drivers to that of being almost semi-professionals in emergency attendance as they are now has been an important step in giving these men the status and the pride in their work that has gained them a very high reputation in this province today.

We have seen a tremendous improvement in the service, and the government of this province deserves credit for the steps they have taken at least in this direction. But the area that is still deficient is in the area with regard to professional people. There is unquestionably a fear that creeps over the border from the United States which grips many of our doctors and nurses with regard to anything that happens when they are working in an emergency situation that could cause a reflection on their own professional standard and could result in a lawsuit.

The cases I've heard of in this situation are entirely American. There are legal procedures in the United States where the splitting of the benefits or any proceeds from lawsuits has encouraged legal procedures which I'm pleased that we do not see in Canada. It's a most destructive situation down there.

I think my brother-in-law, who is a surgeon in Kingston, New York, told me that the insurance rates against these malpractice suits are now up in excess of 10 per cent of one's income. The rates are rising astronomically, just because of this matter of legal procedure south of the border. I'm glad that the laws in this country don't include such a process and such a temptation on the part of the legal profession?

But coming back to the matter of the Canadian law; just to be sure we do have protection for our professional people doing work when they have no possible benefit of remuneration in the way of compensation for their work, when it is strictly a matter of helping their fellow man, we should have a clear legislation that they are not liable in any way unless there is a definite indication of malpractice; or of just stupidity on their part, I can't see as something that we would ever encounter.

I think that this legislation is needed. It's important to have us pass this law in this province. We need to ensure that the greatest virtue, that of helping one's brother, is encouraged not discouraged. We realize that the word help means intelligent assistance, not just hasty, thoughtless action which could really harm the victim more than assist him.

So I hope in many ways, not only in the passing of this law but in improved training, in first aid by a much larger cross section of the people, by improving the standards of our firemen, policemen and ambulance men, as we have already done to quite an extent in this province, and by giving protection to our professional people, we will make this province a safer place in case any of us encounter unfortunate accidents.

I therefore urge support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill of the member for Welland South. My colleagues are saying I have had such a hard time to make my Speech from the Throne and in the budget debate contributions that they thought I

should give them now, so that while I am on my feet I have something to do. My colleague from London North took away a great deal of my thunder when he started talking about the medical parts and the arteries in the dark, but I have had—

Mr. Stokes: The members ought to get together on these things.

Mr. Walker: He is going to talk about law.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): We are free thinkers!

Mr. McIlveen: I would like to talk about two personal experiences I have had in which I came out on top but I could have had quite a serious suit because of an act such as this.

In the first one, I was quite young in practice and I happened upon a very serious car accident. During that car accident a young lady was hit in the groin by, probably, a steering wheel; it pierced right through her femoral artery. At that time I was about three cars back and I got a little rear-end accident, but with the "D" licence they took me up right away. With the aid of a scarf and a round stone and two belts, we put a tourniquet on that girl's leg. Fortunately we were only eight miles from a hospital and we got there in time, and the girl kept her leg.

I often wonder—I didn't follow it up. I was so busy with other happenings around that I didn't follow it up, but it was in the dark. If that girl had lost her leg, could I have been liable? I think under our present laws that I could have been.

Another experience I had happened about six years ago. This is a lot like the member from London North said when he said: "Is there ever a doctor in the house;" in the theatre or something? I happen to look after a hockey club at home—our Oshawa Generals —and if I am in the house on Saturday night everybody knows it. One night about five or six years ago we had a hockey player called Bobby Orr—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He didn't make it, that guy!

Mr. McIlveen: He made it.

Mr. Deans: He didn't make it to the big time at all.

Mr. McIlveen: He made it to the big time and he made it pretty good with us, too.

He came over the blue line this night and he let his horrendous slap shot go and the defenceman who was protecting against him put out his stick. The puck caught the stick, went up over the glass and cut a young girl on the side of the face and crushed a great deal of her malar bone, just under her eye.

I worked on that young lady for about 30 minutes before I could get her to the hospital to get some definitive treatment. The next day the father came down and threatened to sue me. Under our law I think I could have been. I think it is ridiculous.

I think this is a part of the good Samaritan. There is no chance of any recompense. I think the original good Samaritan happened, according to St. Luke, about 2,000 years ago.

It is fortunate for him that he came down the road after the act, too, because this is another part of the Act that is wrong. If you actually view an act of some violence and you stand back—the member for London North tells me that now we have some compensation for that. I think we should have some compensation for the healing arts written into this legislation, so that if a professional man is in his own field, he shouldn't be liable to be sued for something that he is doing in good faith, to the best of his knowledge and ability, under a certain set of circumstances. I think the hon. member for London North mentioned a good consideration. Can we, as doctors or nurses, be expected to work under poor light conditions, under poor operating conditions? Even if we have our bags, if we have a few of the things we have to work with, can we be expected to work in that kind of a habitat and work as well as we do in an operating room where we have everything at our disposal—and we also can shift the blame onto the nurses there too!

An hon. member: The member wouldn't do that!

Mr. McIlveen: Well I always say, when in doubt blame the nurse, or my secretary, I don't know which.

But I really feel very strongly in support of the hon. member for Welland South, that this Act is a good one and it should be considered by the government. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, when the good doctor who has just spoken mentioned the case of the girl with the punctured artery, he probably would not, in my opinion, be liable under English law as it presently stands. It would be a question of the degree and kind of care being exercised

on the occasion in question, done by the standard of a reasonable man, equipped with such virtues as doctors are supposed to have. If he were negligent according to those standards, then of course he could be sued. So theoretically he could be sued in that regard, but the likelihood seems to me extremely remote.

These two bills that we have before us, the one of the member for Welland South which we're discussing today, and Bill 147 of the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), which are pretty well four-square bills, fairly well repetitive of each other's intent, do diversely describe what the degree of negligence involved is. In the case of Bill 122 it's, "the physician or doctor or any other person—the kind of omission, or the kind of negligence—unless such acts constitute wilful or wanton misconduct on his part."

That wording is borrowed from the Criminal Code, with respect to certain kinds of driving called "wanton." That's a very difficult thing to set your finger on.

The member for High Park's bill speaks on more, perhaps commonplace terms so far as lawyers are concerned. The negligence would occur, he would not be liable, "unless it was established that the injuries or death were caused by gross negligence on his part." So they are seeking in both instances to raise the level of care and the type of skill required, and in this regard to exculpate the medical profession, and other people coming onto the scene to aid people, from liability unless a very high degree of negligence were proven by the plaintiff in the case, and that's all to the good.

I think it's interesting to take a passage out of English law to see just how far this thing goes. It's really American law here, but it's pretty well in accord with Canadian law—implies that because of this reluctance to recognize non-feasance, that is the failure to act at all, we are far better not to act at all than to act and to misfeas. Because of this reluctance to countenance non-feasance as a basis of liability, the law has not recognized the moral obligation of common decency to assist another human being who is in danger.

The expert swimmer with a boat at hand who sees another drowning before his eyes may sit on the dock, smoke his cigarette and watch him drown. A physician is under no duty to answer the call of one who is dying and might be saved. Nor is anyone required to play the part of good Samaritan and bind up the wounds of a stranger who is bleeding to death, or even to cry a warning to one who is walking into the jaws of a dangerous machine.

This is the whole negative aspect of the thing. Once a person has launched upon a course of conduct to assist another then a certain measure of obligation and responsibility falls upon him and that measure. I agree, has been altogether too high.

But this is not in its full scope good Samaritan legislation, not called The Good Samaritan Act. The Good Samaritan legislation would say that it was a duty in law, mandatory under fine or penalty of some kind, to assist, to positively go to the rescue. The law hesitates at that particular point, refuses to do so; and some of the reasons given, I suppose, are reasons in high practicality.

One of the reasons at law school I used to hear is suppose the expert swimmer, suppose there wasn't just one of those fellows standing on the beach with his boat, but 50 of them; and they all stood there and watched the poor devil drown, who would you hold responsible in that particular case?

Now these are the kind of legal conundrums that law professors, and some students like myself, like to play around with. This does present difficult problems when you get into the niceties of the thing. But this does show how far short English law falls from humanity; this is a binding instance in case.

The reason for it is set forth in what I consider possibly the most percipient, the wisest piece of writing done on general problems of law, covering the widest area from marriage relationships to death, by an American lawyer, a practising lawyer not a teacher, by the name of Edmund Cohn. Cohn has written a book called, "The Rights and Wrongs in the Light of American Law; The Moral Decision." He takes case after case in various pertinent areas of the law and comments on it, and his comments are grist to the mill for laymen. The comments are not technical, they are just straight horse sense; but there aren't such horses around any more. What he has to say about this sort of thing is extremely interesting.

As a matter of fact, he starts his commentary on this kind of legislation by mentioning the somewhat famous American case where two cousins were riding on a railway train, Herbert Wagner and Arthur. Now Herbert I think it was, in the darkness of night as they came over a trestle the train jarred and threw him off. They went across the bridge near Buffalo and the train stopped. The cousin got off and went back in the darkness to try and locate him. Other

travellers from the train went below the trestle and found the body of Herbert Wagner.

In the meantime the cousin had found his hat, but had lost his footing and fell from the trestle and landed on the ground beside the searchers. He didn't die, but the question arose as to who should succour him and whether they would. They proceeded to do so.

Subsequently he sued the International Railway Co. The question was as to whether or not the railway company was under any obligation to him on the basis of a good Samaritan concept. The case was tried in the lower court and the judge held that he could not recover damages unless he could prove both that the conductor had invited him to go onto the bridge and that the conductor had followed him with a lantern.

On this ruling Arthur lost his case in the court and appealed to the highest court of the state of New York. On behalf of a unanimous court of appeal, Judge Cardoza—was a pathfinder in the law; he broke new ground constantly; he was an imaginative, perceptive wise judge, and his name is legend along with Holmes and others as being men who are not hidebound, who will break out of the confining meshes of law and set up new legislation, which he did all the way along the line on these things—he reversed the judgement of the lower court. He said:

> Danger invites rescue. The cry of distress is the summons to relief. The law does not ignore these reactions of the mind in tracing conduct to its consequences. It recognizes them as normal. It places their effects within the range of the natural and probable. The wrong that imperils life is the wrong to the imperilled victim. It is a wrong also to his rescuer.

And so anybody—the law was extended about this time—who placed another person in a position of danger which required a rescuer, that individual then became responsible to that rescuer.

> Moreover, Arthur's case was not defeated by the mere fact that the circumstances gave him an adequate chance to deliberate and to weigh the risks he was running.

Because there is a rule in English law known as *volenti non fit injuria*, that is, if you take a risk knowing what you are doing no damages arise out of that. This used to apply to working men before the Workmen's Compensation Act. We said: "They went into the factory freely, if their hand happened to be cut off it wasn't the employer's fault; they took that risk."

In the case of Good Samaritan law which is just in its genesis and its infancy, the breakthrough was coming at the time of 1926 when Cardoza gave this judgement.

> Moreover, Arthur's case was not defeated by the mere fact of the circumstances—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

The hon. member's allotted time has expired. However, if no other hon. member wishes to enter the debate there are still two or three minutes remaining, the member may proceed.

Does any other member wish to enter the debate? If not, the hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I've just got one more sentence, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The railway company claimed that even if it could be made liable where the rescuers' actions were instinctive, it could not be held liable where the rescuer had time to reflect and made his own choice, but Judge Cardoza ruled:

> The law does not discriminate between the rescuer oblivious of peril and the one who counts the cost. It is enough that the act, whether impulsive or deliberate, is the child of the occasion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If no other member wishes to participate this will conclude the private members' hour.

Clerk of the House: The 25th Order; House in committee of supply, Mr. R. D. Rowe in the Chair.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m. the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 5, 1972

Attendance of ministers during question period, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3161

Complaints from Indians, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Stokes 3162

Regional government, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3163

Dismissal of director of ROM, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer 3164

U of T governing council, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Lewis 3166

Vote on freshwater fish marketing, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Stokes 3167

Emprise Corp. activities, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shulman 3168

Toronto garbage strike, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Singer 3168

Italian studies at U of T, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Dukszta 3169

Proposed increases by Bell Canada, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. B. Newman 3169

Sudbury court sittings, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Martel 3170

Extension of regional aid, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Yakabuski 3170

New Toronto airport, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deacon, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Bullbrook 3171

Highway 17 paving, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Laughren 3171

Heritage Ontario, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Reid 3171

Presenting commissioner's report on conduct of Metro Toronto police, Mr. Bales 3172

Securities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 3173

Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 3173

County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 3173

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, continued 3173

Private members' hour 3194

Liability in Respect of Voluntary Emergency Medical and First Aid Services, bill to relieve persons from, on second reading, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Walker, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Deacon, Mr. McIlveen, Mr. Lawlor 3194

Recess, 6 o'clock 3203

No. 81

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, June 5, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
(concluded)

On vote 2203:

Mr. Chairman: I believe when we rose before the dinner hour we were just starting vote 2203, assistance to school authorities programme. Would it be the desire of the House to consider these items separately; items 1, 2, 3?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1 carried?

Item 1, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2 carried! Item 3, financial assistance to school authorities. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask of the minister a few questions concerning grant regulations as they apply to certain school boards.

It is my understanding that the grants were increased by a maximum of $60 for the coming year. If the board, with a limitation of $595 as the ceiling, did not spend any more than $510 in the previous year, would they have been allowed to increase their ceiling by $85 rather than only the $60, to bring them up to $595?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question is no. If that was an elementary school board the $60 maximum increase would come into play; so the $60 would be the maximum, even though they were $85 below the ceiling.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Minister, are you not penalizing a board that was extremely economical in the previous year and now wanted to enrich its programme by the addition of extra types of programmes for the students? Are you not denying them the extra funds to they would be on a par with all other boards at the $595?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Actually, Mr. Chairman, the ceiling went up $50, and the amount that they could go up was $60. Now, it was felt that $60 was a pretty substantial increase for a board in this category. For instance, if it happened to go up the $85, or in some cases to be $90 or $100, the impact on the local ratepayers would be too much. And so we felt that as well as increasing the ceilings by $50, which is what we did, we would also set a maximum to which a board could jump if it was below the ceiling. Now, that's a weighted $60; there are a few things that could change the $60 slightly.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the minister's explanation, but the board that now wanted to implement new types of programmes—but is in the category of not being too well off—finds itself at a disadvantage because of the same $60 increase; but its maximum now is $20 less. In fact, for the one board that I referred to, its 1971 ordinary expenditure was $510 and the $60 increase would limit it to $570; whereas the ceiling for 1972 with other boards is $595. Now, if that board had the other $25 per student, it could implement some of the programmes it sorely needs and hesitated to implement in previous years.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's quite true, Mr. Chairman, that it does hold that board's increase down to some degree; but a $60 increase in a board that is spending that much per pupil is going to be a substantial increase. It's going to have an impact on the mill rate, and the idea here was to prevent any really large escalation of mill rates in these particular areas. That's why we put this ceiling in.

Now, this is one of the areas that we're going to be studying when the results come in this year. The hon. members probably got letters from some of the boards that have been in to see us already to tell us about this particular problem. These are the boards who were well below the ceiling and who say that they could have gone up substantially if the $60 wasn't in there. I'm not sure that many of them would have really gone up that much even if that limit hadn't been in there—

Mr. B. Newman: But it does penalize the poorer—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, not necessarily. You see the other boards, who are at the ceilings, went up much, much less than the $60. While they did increase the amount they spent per pupil, it was less than $60—quite a bit less.

Mr. B. Newman: But specific boards that would like to implement programmes hesitate because of the limitations. Remember, when you're dealing with a separate school board, it doesn't have the same tax base that other boards do. As a result, even a $20 increase could be extremely substantial to it; unless provision were made to increase the total amount of revenue available per student.

Now, this applies not only to the implementation of academic or enrichment programmes, but also for the after-school use of facilities; because they are sort of an extraordinary expenditure and wouldn't come under the grant ceiling. But because of that board's limited tax base, it's at a real handicap to even provide its facilities for use by outside organizations. So, Mr. Minister, I think you're going to have to look at that if you intend school boards to make their facilities available on an after-school basis.

There is another question I wanted to ask to the minister. What happens if a school board finds its enrolment dropping and wishes to convert possibly two classrooms into one great, big library or multi-purpose room? In other words, it is going to renovate. If I'm not mistaken, it is allowed 90 per cent for grant purposes, but it has to pay the other 10 per cent. Now, when it comes to a separate school board, again with a limited tax base, it is handicapped. It can't do a lot of the things that it would like to do because of the limited tax base. It is unable to provide additional, or even better facilities for its students. Could I have some reply from the minister concerning that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, for the separate school boards, here is the way the grants are worked now. A board of the same wealth, whether it be a public board or a separate school board, if it spends the same amount per pupil, will be getting the same rate of grant from us, so that if the board doesn't have the potential of assessment among its local taxpayers it is going to be getting a much heftier grant from the province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): For grades 9, 10 and 11?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, but the total amount of—

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, at the elementary school level, the whole grant. They get the regular elementary school grants for the grades 9 and 10 level.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They won't be getting the same as the public school board?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They are getting the same rate on an elementary school grant. The regular secondary school 9s and 10s are paid on the secondary school per-pupil grant.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right! We will get around to that later.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is another matter. Therefore, they are getting a large grant from the province and they have the opportunity to put this on their own local tax base, but I suppose it does present some problems to them. Most of the separate school boards don't want to have a tax levy that is greater than the public school board in their particular area, so I suppose this to some degree limits the amount that they wish to put on their local levy.

But as far as the grant is concerned we have arrived at the point where if they spend the same amount of money as the public school board per pupil they will be getting more grant, depending on their wealth. I am sorry, they will be getting the same revenue, they will be getting more grant.

Mr. B. Newman: The per-pupil revenue is still less as far as the separate school is concerned in relation to the public school, but were a board to turn around and put a library facility on to a school, an addition, there would be a 100 per cent grant available?

Hon. Mr. Wells: If which?

Mr. B. Newman: A library facility.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. B. Newman: Now, if a board is going to do exactly the same thing but move walls on the inside of the school—it is doing the same thing now, it doesn't need the classroom space—there is only a 90 per cent grant available. Why shouldn't you accommodate them both in the same fashion? After all, they are really saving the taxpayer money by not putting an extra facility on and putting

what they have in the school to better use by either enlarging, eliminating walls, or accommodating their own students after a fashion.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Our grant on new facilities isn't necessarily 100 per cent. It could be around 90 per cent, it could be somewhere between 90 and 100 per cent, and on a renovation it is averaged out and 90 per cent makes it fairly equitable.

Mr. B. Newman: The grant is almost 100 per cent from the information that I am given, whereas on the remodelling it is not that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is only 100 per cent for certain boards, or it is 97½, you can't categorically say it is 100 per cent for everybody. We would have to know the board and then find out what the rate of grant is on approved capital costs for new construction, but it isn't 100 per cent for every board in the province.

Mr. B. Newman: No, but it is substantially more than the 90 per cent for renovation.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Not necessarily.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): I would like to ask the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, several questions regarding aid to the school authorities:

1. Is any help being given to the school boards when it comes to phasing out the one-room schools that are still in existence in the province?

2. In those schools that are launching a pre-kindergarten programme, are you giving them recognition as being a special education type of class and providing the grants that are appropriate?

3. What is the status at the present time that would appear to be going to be of the level of library services across the province in the schools? I continually get vibrations that it is library services that seem to be being cut in a lot of the schools, either being cut through attendance or through teachers in the library programmes.

4. When you granted to the Toronto board the right to classify, I think it was 75 per cent of their administrative expenses as being of the extraordinary nature, did you then apply this in a consistent way across the province to all school boards? And my last question: What has happened to the debts of the small boards when they were brought into the regional or so-called superboards several years ago?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, in answer to your last question about the debts of the small school boards that were amalgamated into the larger units, we have been paying those off over a number of years. They will be paid off by next year.

Now as for the other questions, if I can remember them all, I think one was whether there is any penalty or extra grant for closing down one-room schools. No, there is no extra grant; there is no penalty. There is a grant for the new facility that is built, but there is no extra grant.

Mr. Laughren: What about busing?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, the grant for busing is the regular transportation grant. That's a separate arrangement.

Regarding junior kindergartens, the space for junior kindergartens is considered as normal space in a school. There is no special grant for it. They are not considered as special education; they are considered as part of the school. I find most of the schools around Metro that are moving into junior kindergartens this year are using existing space because of decreasing enrolments. The facilities are there in most cases; they are the regular senior kindergarten facilities which are now not used. A lot of schools have double kindergartens and they are just not being used to their full extent now.

Mr. Laughren: Can you put as many students into the pre-kindergarten class?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, that of course is up to the school board. They have to decide how they are going to run the junior kindergartens, and I don't know how many they are going to open at this point in time.

Regarding library services, again this is a matter for the determination of the local school boards as they set their own spending priorities. And at this point I haven't had any indication of what the school boards across the province have had to do in this particular area. I haven't had too many requests or suggestions that this area was being hard hit because of the ceilings; there has been the odd one but nothing out of the ordinary. It will form part of our study as we look at budgets and find out exactly what did happen this year.

In regard to the Metropolitan Toronto situation, where expenditures were moved from ordinary expenditures to extraordinary expenditures, any that applied across the province applied equally to all the boards across the province.

Mr. Laughren: Is this true whether or not they applied to have them categorized in such a way?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, it was at the board's choice. The item you are probably talking about is in regard to community use of schools. This was an optional item which said that a board could, if it wished, transfer some of those funds out of ordinary expenditure into extraordinary expenditure. This was at the option of the board, because if they were taken out and put in extraordinary expenditure there was no grant on it. Thus, if a board found that within its ceilings it could maintain those expenses in ordinary expenditures, it was to its advantage to leave them in there for the time being—so it probably did. If it wished to transfer them, then it made application to us, and about 30 boards across the province applied to do this and did it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the views of the minister in regard to a brief that I presented to him on behalf of the township of Puslinch a few weeks ago.

There can be strong arguments made by the township and by the county school board of Wellington as to who is right and who is wrong, but one of the things that has come out of this arbitration hearing, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that both the school board and the township feel that it is a little bit ludicrous to the county and to the school board to have treasurers sit on their own decisions of who is going to pay the additional cost.

I understand from that meeting that there has been a brief sent to the Ontario Public School Trustees recommending that changes be made in that procedure. I would like your views as to whether—now that the county system has been in effect, I guess it's three years—it doesn't merit some change in regard to this method of deciding what the township should pay, or what is fair to a township's obligations in regard to increased costs.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, I'm afraid I haven't got that brief or comments on that here. Perhaps I can get it sent over and we can discuss it in a few minutes, when it comes, if its all right with—

Mr. Chairman: All right. The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): On the same point.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Well if he wants to carry on the same point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Good: On the same point, yes. I would like to speak in general on the matter of the appeal procedure for municipalities within a county board as to the equity or their ability to pay the levy which is against them for school purposes.

The appeal process now, as the minister knows, is that the treasurers of all the municipalities get together and decide what is fair and what is equitable. It is just inconceivable that the treasurer from one municipality is going to say, "Yes, I believe the other municipality has been improperly treated and they can't stand that much adjustment on their education tax this year, so my municipality will help to equalize the payment and pay a higher levy in my municipality."

The minister must surely know that the only answer to the problem is that which has recently been adopted for the same problem which arose in many of the regional government setups. At first the transitional adjustments had to be made within the area governments of the region. This is the same as the adjustments now having to be made within the area municipalities of the school board. But the only solution is the infusion of external funds from outside to help alleviate the hardships that have been created—usually it is in rural municipalities. I found in our own county school board it is the rural municipalities which have been hit hardest by increased education costs than have the cities.

To get the treasurers of all the municipalities within the county school board together to try to find an equitable solution is ridiculous unless there is an infusion of external funds. The present legislation as it was passed in the county school board bill in 1968 doesn't permit this. The regional governments found that they had to put

some provincial funds in to equalize the payments of the area governments.

I think the minister will find that that is going to be the only solution to bring some equity into the rural municipalities and to help them defray the tremendous increase in cost that some have had since the inception of county school boards. Has this thought ever been taken up by the minister and his department—that it should be provincial funds which help to equalize the burden, rather than trying to adjust the tax load within the county itself?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, we of course do have a procedure now where we pay a subsidy if any area is going to go more than one equalized mill over the post-subsidy break-even mill rate—the 1969 one. So this does level out to some degree any real differences.

But I really don't see how we can consider the alternative of an infusion of more money from external sources to try to solve this. We are already now infusing a substantial amount of money. We are giving up to 60 per cent of the cost of education as opposed to about 38 to 40 per cent provincial support in the cost of other total municipal services, so that somewhere along the line these things have to even themselves out.

I would suggest that perhaps this arrangement with the treasurers is not a good one. I was taking a look at it a few weeks ago after the hon. member brought his particular brief to me. I haven't got an answer or a solution to it at this point in time but I think that perhaps we will have to try to come up with something a little more equitable. I am not sure that we can accept that—in fact, I'm sure we can't accept—the solution as just, for us to pour more money into trying to equalize this.

Mr. Good: They had to with the regional government problem. It has to come from somewhere!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Of course, any problem can be solved easily if you can just hand money out. That is the easy way.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, one final observation: We must remember that the educational grants, at least the levies from the various municipalities to the board, are tied very closely to the equalized assessment factor and this factor is, in my view, a very critical thing. A fluctuation very slightly, up or down, can mean a tremendous difference when it comes to the amount of grants required by that municipality. I think that the equalization factor has a lot of inequities in it. The fact that even after the province is set up on market-value assessment, the provision for an equalization factor is still left in the new Assessment Act after we have supposedly equalized everything at market value.

Our assessment people still say we may have to adjust with an equalization factor because it is still in our new Act of 1968. When you are dealing with anything as ambiguous as that factor has been, and the fact that a variation up or down of one or two points can mean a tremendous variation in the grant, I feel that something is going to have to be done to try to bring—

The minister says if we now have 60 per cent, this is 60 per cent across the board. I will say for the cities in our particular county, Kitchener-Waterloo, it has worked out very well for the municipalities within the cities. But the rural municipalities have been hit very hard by the establishment of the county school boards and are looking for something more than just an adjustment within the county itself.

The appeal from the treasurers, I believe, is to the OMB, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Right!

Mr. Good: To the OMB. How many appeals have there been to the OMB on the levies of the various municipalities within the county school boards?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm afraid I can't give the hon. member an exact number but I am told there are a significant number.

Mr. Good: A significant number; I don't doubt it at all.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the vote on architectural services passed so quickly, but should the minister have the information available on what we were talking about this afternoon I think we can get into it on this vote anyway. Does the department make special provisions for local boards if they wish to add, in their planning for new schools, those very, very few architectural items such as ramps or, as we were mentioning this afternoon, the pos-

sibility of an elevator in a multi-level school for those who are physically handicapped?

The information I have in a brief that they submitted to the select committee on the utilization of educational facilities, indicates that if it's planned at the beginning, the additional cost is very, very minimal, about one per cent of the total. I am just wondering what the department's response is to that kind of move being taken by local school authorities when constructing new school buildings?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We have no provision now in our manual that insists that the school boards include any of this in their planning of schools at the present time. I think it is a first-rate idea and I'll be happy to see that it is pursued because I think that while it may be perhaps not as paramount in importance in the school use of the building, it certainly is going to be of great use in the community, just as we have agreed in this government that all government buildings that are now to be built are to have these facilities in them. So, I will certainly give the member the assurance that we will pursue this now.

Although we have been encouraging boards to do this when the plans come in, there is nothing in any of our specifications to indicate that they should consider this.

Mr. Foulds: Fine. Thanks very much, Mr. Minister. Moving on to another item, in the article that was in the Globe and Mail on June 1, on Thursday, how accurate was that figure that was quoted in the article for Dufferin county, I believe it was, that their per-pupil limit for elementary school was $532 for an elementary school pupil and $1,000 for secondary school; and the claim by the director of education there that that was much less than allowed in other areas? The thrust of the article seemed to be that the system that was behind, if you like, when the regional boards were implemented, remained behind. The comparative figures for Metro Toronto's ceiling were actually $786 for an elementary pupil and $1,282 for secondary school students. Were those accurate, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, those figures are accurate. Our ones are just pretty close. I've got $530 and $1,500 which is within a few dollars of those.

Mr. Foulds: Doesn't the minister agree—I don't know if you read that article, or your officials did—that in cases such as that board, it seems to me that all the K weighting factors haven't balanced out, that there is a case there where rural students aren't getting the pre-elementary education that perhaps they could very well benefit from? Perhaps that should be taken into consideration somehow when considering your weighting factors. I'll just pause there and let the minister respond. Have you had special representation from the Dufferin county school board?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I haven't had any special representation, Mr. Chairman. From time to time the director phones me—he is an old friend of mine—and tells me what is going on up there. I haven't had any special representation, but I did read with great interest the article that was in the Globe and Mail the other day.

The interesting thing here though is that, as I stated earlier, certainly one of our basic premises and goals is equality of educational opportunity. Now I am not naive enough to think that we can reach that overnight. I think that we are working toward that. But the very point that my friend over here brought up a few minutes ago comes into play. For them to be able to do all the programmes that they want and have them all would necessitate a rise in mill rate in that area more than most of the municipalities probably could stand or would want to stand. That is the situation.

So really what most of these boards are doing is they are staging things over a period of a number of years—not too long I hope—and I certainly think the setup is there to achieve this equality. But they are not going to do it overnight. The interesting thing is that that particular article focused on junior kindergartens, and I haven't had an opportunity to study that exactly there, but in Metropolitan Toronto it is really not costing much extra at all to establish junior kindergartens. The amount of extra grant that they will get and so forth will almost carry the total programme.

Mr. Foulds: I'd like to get into this whole area. I know it is the department's hope and the minister's hope that the ceilings will help curtail the expenses, that that is necessary. There is a kind of dichotomy here, that I suppose was pinpointed in an article that was in this morning's Globe and Mail, and a feeling on the part of at least some trustees—and I am quoting a report here in this province; it is called "Centralized Control and Decentralized Blame" — that the trustees get the criticism because they have to make

the decisions, but they don't have the decision about the overall cost itself.

My concern goes even deeper, I think, and I promised in my opening remarks that I would detail the story of some of the interaction that took place between the Toronto board, the Metro board and the Department of Education. I don't want to unnecessarily prolong the debate, but I think it is important to get a statement on record to show that one of the things that seems to be happening is that the decision-making process is being eroded away from the school trustees, or the elected responsible officials in the area, and it is falling to the administrators.

I think I should say that I have boiled this down from a 42-page document; so if there are a few gaps in the development of the thesis, I hope you will bear with me.

Let's take the Toronto board, for example; it has to react not only to the departmental regulations but also to the decisions of the Metro school board—and I know the Metro school board is representative to some extent of the individual Metro school boards. But in some senses the policy-making leeway that the boards used to have with regard to budgeting leads to a political vacuum for the trustees. I would suggest that this has been filled rather unfortunately, although I think once again with sincerity, by certain administrators.

In operation formerly, the development of the Metro-wide education budget used to be a bottom-up process. The local boards first built up from their own estimates their current budgets which, after approval by the local board, were submitted to the Metro board. Next the Metro board reviewed the various budgets, and at this point a significant political leeway is offered to the Metro board. In carrying out its responsibilities to set the Metro-wide levy, the Metro board had the ability to evaluate the necessity of different items in the local budget. The Metro board may have disallowed some items.

However, a measure of local autonomy was ensured by two options open to the local boards; they could appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board to have the items reinstated in the composite budget or they could raise the funds for the disallowed items by means of a local tax levy up to a maximum of 2½ mills; in 1969 I think this represented about five per cent of a local board's budget. That has changed, I understand, to some extent.

Toward the end of the Sixties, it just so happened that financial arrangements like that were not ensuring adequate control over educational expenditures. Total expenditures in Ontario, for example, had risen astronomically between 1943 and even 1963. But it seems that at the end of 1969 probably one of the significant changes took place. The amendment to the Department of Education Act, Bill 228, which passed the Ontario Legislature, enabled the Minister of Education to make regulations—and I believe I am quoting directly and accurately here—"governing estimates that a board is required to prepare and expenditures that may be made by a board for any purpose." I think that has been the key shift in the whole budgeting process.

Admittedly, and I don't think we really quarrel on this point, fiscal centralization was implemented by the province to control education costs. If education costs had kept rising as they did in the 1960s there is no doubt that education would assume an even greater proportion of the total provincial expenditures; this was not desirable and the ceilings were a result.

What has happened, it seems to me, with the imposition of the ceiling limitation is that the budgetary process in this area has changed from a bottom-up to a top-down process. After the announcement of the guidelines by the minister in November, 1971, the Metro board's budgetary strategy goes into full operation. What it attempts to do is to ascertain the exact size of the Metro education pie and, then, to divide it equitably between the area boards.

The development of the Metro strategy for 1972 is, it seems to me, rather unfortunately rooted in the summer months of last year. The key summer meeting was a conference held at Aston Villa, Bracebridge, in June. In the eyes of the administrators in attendance, the directors of the area boards and their senior financial staff, the meeting was not a policy-making meeting. For that reason, only four school board chairmen were invited to the meeting and, at that, for only half of the weekend.

Rough estimates at that meeting were outlined showing a Metro-wide budget cut of up to $32 million, and alternate methods available to cut budgets were presented. The major outcome of the Aston Villa session seems to have been that it opened up discussions with the Department of Education. Later the administrators presented the budget facts to the department and arranged a special field trip to demonstrate the special needs of the inner city.

We don't know the exact results of these pressures, although Mr. McCordic mentioned at a Metro finance committee meeting that, and I am quoting directly here, "Meetings of the council of directors with the minister influenced the setting of the ceiling.

Earlier in 1971, through a mechanism that had been created to review the board's budget, a budget committee had been created. I think that it had a certain ineffectiveness in grasping hold of the whole budgetary process. It points to some internal factors within the Toronto board which created a certain indecisiveness on the part of the trustees.

The budget committee was first formed as a subcommittee of the finance committee, and it wasn't until Oct. 7, after that June meeting, that the trustees obtained a copy of the minutes of the Aston Villa meeting. Even then they were received, I understand indirectly, and although Mr. Bonham, the Toronto chairman had attended the meeting, he had not submitted a detailed report to the trustees, only a short notice on Aug. 23.

The problem that we face is that the trustees had at that meeting, I gather, 200 pages of agenda, and four or more meetings a week, and they missed this notice. It points out the difficulty that the local people have. It was much later in February, February 29, I believe—and I have discussed this earlier so I won't go into detail on it—that the meeting which put forth what the board calls "sample four" budget process was held. What happened at that meeting, it seems to me, is that the trustees' actions indicated that they weren't aware of the rules of the game for the budget cutting.

For example, during the presentation of the various briefs the trustees were uncertain which way to turn. One trustee, for example, wondered whether or not aid could be received from the federal government for the new Canadian programme. Then, one trustee asked the director when the estimates would be submitted to the trustees. Then the director insisted this was not feasible until Metro had divided the pie. Another trustee challenged the director, asking "Why had all the delegations been invited when we're not considering real budget cuts?" The reply was they couldn't do that until the next stage.

In part, the quandary of the trustees does lie in the necessity for the Toronto board to wait until the decisions are made from above. Perhaps it is understandable that the trustees feel a certain amount of frustration in view of this. We saw that the administration, either inadvertently or deliberately, withheld information on the Aston Villa conference, set the agendas for the budget committee and helped initiate special private budget meetings.

Such administrative decisions have very wide policy ramifications and it's that which really bothers me. It seems to me that the alternatives open to the trustees are continually being closed by the administration. I'm sure of the minister's sincerity when he indicates to us that what he really wants the local boards to do is to consider rationally their priorities in spending and their school system's effectiveness.

What happened in the Toronto setup proves that at least that is somewhat difficult to do because when six of the Toronto trustees took that approach and trustee Nelson moved that the board adopt a list of six priority items the meeting, for lack of confidence in the way they were moving, did not pass that. Instead, a motion was passed supporting a referendum on provincial ceiling limitations. That didn't solve the problem either.

It seems to me that while it is true that the operation of the grant scheme includes weighting factors for special locations and for special programmes, the boards used to have more strength in bargaining with the ministry for using the weighting factors. They got some elbow room this time in terms of the definition of what were extraordinary expenditures.

This leverage is really very far outweighed by the minister's present authority.

It seems to me two events particularly illustrate the predicament that happened in Toronto. Until late February the grant regulations had not been issued. I think it would be certainly valuable, if it is at all possible, to get those regulations issued somewhat earlier. Because the grant regulations hadn't been issued, the exact size of the grants could not be calculated. It was in mid-March when the minister indicated that some of the more extreme talk had died down.

I was going through my clipping file and it seems it started around March and that it declined somewhat from those thick folders I was getting in November and December. It was partially because it was in mid-March that the guidelines were discussed between the minister and the local board. Hopefully, that process can be moved forward.

The whole point I am trying to make is

that with decentralization we are in a real conundrum here. We hark back to the local autonomy theme, which has been one of the major premises on which the Ontario school system has been predicated historically, weighed against the necessity for central financing.

It seems that with the centralization of political power—and the financing means political power; let's not fool around about that—the lower level must wait rather uncertainly until the upper level has made its next move.

Now, the process is complicated in Toronto because the budgetary process developed by the Metro school system in response to the ceiling limitations created a kind of double centralization. In the past the local area boards approved their own estimates, and then sent them up to the Metro board. In 1971, the Metro board added another stage to the budgetary process. The exact size of the area boards' budget was ascertained by the means of the formula budget, before the estimates were presented to the area boards.

While this procedure may have allowed the Metro staff sufficient time to complete its very complicated task, the extra stage did add uncertainty and complexity to the public and to the local trustees. Below the upper two levels of government, the Toronto Board of Education doesn't seem to have control over the important budgetary decisions. The Metro board sets the budget ceilings under the departmental regulations. The Metro board also determines the pupil-teacher ratio and staff allocation.

Thus, both the size of the Toronto board's budget and the 66 per cent of the budget in 1972 for the instruction category, are not Toronto decisions. Without the key decisions taking place in their board rooms, the Toronto trustees have not been able to pin down where the power lies. Two reports were requested by them from the director this past year upon the exact power of the Metro board and upon the organization of the department of education.

As the budgetary process has progressed, the trustees seem to be coming to understand the limitations of their power. The uncertainty created by the two upper levels, I think, remains.

Now, with the power vacuum at the lower level, this is where the administration obtains its leeway in the definition of its path. For example, the 1972 budget papers contained simply a list of budget cuts amounting to $2.4 million. No reference was made to other possible cuts, or to the basis upon which the recommendations were made. In part, this is reinforced by the trustees' lack of detailed information.

Now either the administration assumes that the trustees have the knowledge; or the administration assumes the information is not necessary for the policy decisions of the trustees. The Aston Villa conference indicates this is the way the administrators think.

Well, I think this is one danger that we really face with administrators. They don't fully recognize the implication of budgeting in terms of policy-making. I would really like to see somewhat more than a pious hope from the minister indicating how the board and the elected trustees can make that policy decision-making a reality, when their hands are tied financially. It seems to me very strongly that in budgetary matters the centralization has really replaced local autonomy and it may support an unhealthy expansion in the sphere of administrative influence.

Now, I would like to just move on from that particular topic for the moment. This is the major thrust of the evening; so that if the members are getting restless, they can relax a bit. I want to talk a little bit about the problem of closing of one-room schools and the centralization of schools. It was brought home to me particularly by a story in the Toronto Star of March 2, 1972. It sort of was one of those nostalgic stories that capture the eye and the heart and that kind of thing. "The Little Red Schoolhouse thrives in Scarborough." It goes on to talk about the C. H. Berner public school. What is interesting about the article is that it is a school for 63 pupils and it was built in 1893, but—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): A good solid foundation.

Mr. Foulds: Right! And it seems that most of the kids enjoy going there. The caretaker cuts their hair and the teacher is the hockey coach and it has all those things that we sometimes hark back to as the good old days.

But, interestingly enough, it also seems to have some of the additional things that we think are important in the current school system in which we have asumed that bigness was necessary. There is educational television, for example, in the school and it seems to me that so far in the estimates I have totalled a number—at least eight—committees or task forces or investigating bodies looking into various aspects of the Department of Education which I think is a healthy thing, because

if any department needs careful and ongoing scrutiny, it is certainly the Department of Education.

But I am just wondering if we have ever really looked at the importance of the learning experience in the small school as opposed to the learning experience in the bigger school. We talked about this earlier, Mr. Minister, whether or not we lose more than we gain sometimes by centralization; whether the busing has a detrimental effect upon the concentration of the learning experience of the children.

What I would really like the department to be able to say is that it has come to a sort of compromise optimum figure in terms of size for elementary and for secondary schools. It seems to me that one of the areas that we may be in danger of losing in the centralization is the sense of community. I am very conscious of this because there is a very small community in my riding that had a one-room school that was closed down. It was in Sibley, which was part of the current Lakehead board, and the residents, when you talked to them, could see the necessity for it; by and large they were not adamantly opposed but, in talking to them you could tell that in regard to that school—and there was a genuine community there, it is about 30 miles outside the Lakehead—there had been a real sense of loss.

This is one area I worry about in terms of the real learning experience for the kids, because that seems to me to be the important thing.

I am just wondering, to sum up, Mr. Minister, if there is any kind of study being done in terms of school sizes and territories in optimum figures in that regard.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I can't tell the hon. member of any actual studies that I know are being done. I am sure that this must be studied by many researchers in this jurisdiction and others because it is timely.

Mr. Foulds: How about a grant in aid?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, there may even be somebody doing this. But it is a question. I can recall it when I was on a school board, people asking, "What is the optimum size of the public school?" "What is the optimum size of a class?" These are questions that perhaps will never really be effectively answered, because each researcher brings his own particular preferences and biases to studies that he does, and there are advantages and disadvantages in every system.

This morning I was at a senior public school. I don't know how many were out there, maybe there were 500 or 600 kids sitting out in front in the auditorium. The former Premier of this province (Mr. Robarts) was accepting a cheque for $2,400 to buy a one-humped camel for the Metropolitan Toronto zoo. This was the first school in Metro that has raised its allotted—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That's an awful opener.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But the significance of this was the spirit that was in that school, and they've named the camel, they have got a picture of him there—

Mr. Deans: What is his name?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Humphrey. Now the significance here was, here was a senior public school and they had a band, which I thought was just excellent. They had a choir, and from the three numbers that they sang, it was obvious that they were one of the best choirs in the whole area; it was quite obvious from listening to them.

There were certain advantages to these students which students in a smaller school wouldn't get. There was a spirit there—there was a sort of esprit de corps—there was a chance to take part in a really good choir, in a band, and in a lot of other activities. I think that somewhere along the line there is also a chance to capture that same intimate relationship between the teacher and the student. This can happen with the kind of things that go on in that school, if you have got the right teachers and receptive students. Somebody a lot more knowledgeable about it than I am will have to research it, but I think that that can happen and perhaps there are great advantages in that kind of setup.

Another illustration comes to mind of a 100-pupil secondary school—I think it is in Cartwright—where the parents have been in to see me many times to tell me of the great advantages and the great benefits that this school has. They tell me about the staff in that school, and the benefits to the students who are attending there, and how these advantages should very definitely outweigh the closing of that school, and the sending of those pupils to a large 1,500-student secondary school. Again, somebody would have to research that, to know whether in the long run those pupils would really benefit or not.

Mr. Laughren: What animal would the present Premier get?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh now, now, now, you probably don't realize the significance. The former Premier is the co-chairman of the fund-raising committee for the Metro Toronto zoo, which will be an attraction of Ontario-wide importance for the students. In fact I would imagine that there will be students from all over Ontario who will be coming down here to see the zoo and it just—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): You would think this province of ours would be rich enough to afford a camel with two humps.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It just happens that it is located in Scarborough also.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There are a couple of matters that I want to raise in this $1 billion vote to pay for the financial assistance to school authorities.

There has always been a complaint that as the percentage of financial assistance goes up, the control is going to be transferred more and more away from the local boards to the Department of Education. I have always thought that argument was deeply flawed, and that the department would have as much control as the minister through the various Acts and regulations they wanted to wield. I think it is characteristic that in the new legislation—not so new now, four years old—the practice was continued that the most important administrative authorities in each of the individual school board jurisdictions could not be hired nor dismissed except with the approval of the minister.

I find it strange that this anachronism should be continued when the minister joins with his colleagues so frequently in talking about a decentralization of authority. There is a feeling, I think, among ratepayers in most communities that the county boards have grown very distant indeed. More and more treat the individuals in the community as experts always treat the unwashed who pay the bills—with a sort of a feeling that is expressed by the phrase "you don't really understand."

I always find this a serious disappointment when the experts, the bureaucrats working for any organization take it over. Somehow there is something inherent in the county board system which seems not always to bring this about but to make it more likely.

As the jurisdiction, of course, is very large, the budgets, even in some of the smaller counties, are extremely large, in the many millions. There is that feeling that only the director, with all of his degrees, and the numberless supervisors who back him up at the various board meetings, that only those people, who have an allegiance to the minister and the department and to the education establishment rather than to the elected board, that only those people can in fact make useful, valid decisions.

I regret this. It has already been mentioned—

Mr. Foulds: Your regret has already been mentioned?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No; I regret this, period!

It has already been mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that at the trustees meeting that was participated in by OISE and others, there was the feeling that the county board system had grown more and more remote, and that in fact it was simply an administrative arm of the ministry rather than an emanation of democracy at the local level. I think we feared this from the very time it was announced back in 1967 in Galt by the former Premier, the friend of the dromedary.

I wish the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) were present, because one of the most interesting statements made in the report of that conference was made by Roger Allan who was an education director in the north, and I think is now in Lincoln or St. Catharines, when he said—

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Great city!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh are you here, Bob? Well, right!

He made the statement that the system was, basically, "centralized control and decentralized blame."

Hon. Mr. Wells: Does the member believe that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes I do; I really do believe it. And if the minister doesn't believe it he is incredibly naive. I think he is kidding us!

As a matter of fact, I think the control is centralized even beyond him.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I was thinking of the blame for it. I think we take all the blame.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think the minister is a little paranoid in that regard.

An hon. member: Good for you!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If you were, I think, to sense some of the frustrations of a citizen locally who campaigns for election to the board. He finds that in the last two or three years, if he lives in an average county, that new administrative offices have been built and he goes in there from perhaps his own dairy farm or from his furniture store, in a few cases from his law practice—not too many lawyers condescend to this level of political activity, they usually have other ambitions—they walk in the front door and they are enveloped by that atmosphere of broadloom and highly polished mosaics—

An hon. member: Air conditioning!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: With air conditioning, large parking lots, the kind of landscaping that, sort of overnight, adds a 40-year development to the landscape, with the great shade trees and the rather conservative signs out in front which all smack of unlimited funds spent with a certain, let's say, Conservative flair.

I really feel that, now that the county boards have been established for a number of years, some of our worst fears have been realized and they have simply been emanations of centralization. If the minister doesn't understand this, then I think probably the focus of centralization is not in his office, but sort of around the office; that feeling that the Olympians are there with their computer clicking away on the floor above and that everything is known, everything is going to be examined. There may be rewards, but there will certainly be punishment for anybody who steps out of line.

I sense this. I feel that it is unhealthy.

I can remember, as I am sure the minister can, when we had the three-man school boards and there used to be an appointed part-time secretary of the board. We used to have the feeling locally, well the secretary had taken the thing over you know, and that the trustee—

Mr. Foulds: You were right!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —and that the trustees are changed year by year, but some old secretary is going on continuing to pay the bills the way he always has. So there may be no solution other than perhaps the replacement of a Conservative government with a Liberal one; a solution that I think would solve many of these problems. We can debate that maybe on this occasion.

Mr. Foulds: That's a solution? That's no solution at all!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wanted to tell the minister—

Mr. Foulds: That is no solution; that is a disaster!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —that his speeches in these estimates, I think, have been good ones. His attitude has been healthy in every respect; and yet I sense that he doesn't really know what is going on in the education establishment across the province; that there is some kind of a malaise that is associated with the kind of centralization that Roger Allan was quoted as speaking about at that conference. I think the thing that's going to happen to him is that he will be brought in and next year will be sitting under the gallery; and the year after that he'll be one of the prominent people advising the minister. Because whenever anything like that happens—

Hon. Mr. Wells: He has had his chance. He has been here; he has left.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, he may come around again, you know—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He just had to come and protect you.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —when the way to the top is not so cluttered. But we will see.

Mr. Singer: He is noticeable by his absence.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's just a little different, somehow.

Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of other matters that I want to raise.

In the minister's answer to a question earlier this evening, he was talking about equality of opportunity and as far as separate schools are concerned, how they get the same grants; or that at least the same total funds are available. We know that these figures are open to some question; but I was particularly interested in his response to an interjection as to the level of grants as per elementary and secondary support.

In the minister's earlier answers to questions he assured the House and the community that it was not his goal to downgrade

separate education by urging boards to co-operate in the sharing of services; usually under the aegis of a public board. There was an indication I think at that time that the minister was prepared to encourage this sort of sharing of services and facilities at every possible opportunity.

I think that the supporters of the separate system have quite adequately shown their concern with this approach. While no one can be opposed to a sharing of facilities at any level; still, it is regrettable if under this guise the historic rights of the separate school supporters are being undermined.

I think if the minister were going to bolster his public assertions that this is not a part of his programme, that he should certainly see that the grants as paid to the established separate system now should be at the same level as paid to the public system; and that when you get beyond grade 8 that they are paid at that level.

I think after the trauma suffered by some people in the examination of the separate school issue a few months ago, that it would be proper if the administration considered very carefully the reasons why at least the grants in the level that has been accepted—that is, to the end of grade 10—be on a par as between the two systems. That this would be one way the ministry and the minister could show his good faith in this regard.

I feel that perhaps in the years that lie ahead—

Mr. Singer: That's a good phrase.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right, I like it myself. In the years that lie ahead we are going to find a much greater dispersal of the hundreds of millions that we vote in support of a public school system. We are going to see the value of other types of education, not only the formal separate system, but others. I would expect that those of us who are able to survive the refining political fires for a few more years will live to see a minister with the support of one or three or four parties, who knows, advancing this cause on the Legislature and on the communtiy. There is a serious undermining of the value of a monolithic system particularly, which perhaps even—

Mr. Foulds: That is in Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —that perhaps even the minister is aware of when he sees this attitude changing in the community.

There is one other specific matter I want to raise, and it has, once again, to do with the administration of separate schools. I think the minister can explain to me and perhaps to others who wonder about it why, when we established the separate school system at the county level, we kept the old geographic approach that had been handed down for so many years. For example, in the county of Brant there are people who live out of range of a separate school system whose children do attend separate schools, but who cannot conveniently nor legally support those schools. Why can't the statute be brought up to date in a more reasonable way, so that the establishment of the school systems is, in fact, more on a par and the separate system is not encumbered with so many of the archaic approaches and regulations which are rooted in the old concept—that it had to be within three miles, and that sort of thing? Surely this could be very conveniently improved by amendments to the statute. I can't understand why this is delayed.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In answer to that last question, I might say that that's a question that I asked when I started looking at the legislation this year. As you will appreciate, there are changes in the Separate Schools Act this year which, while we still preserve that idea of establishing the zone—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What for?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that before a basic change such as that is made, I have got to have a little more time to make sure that we are not violating some principle that was established and rooted in the constitution and in the history of this province. We have broken that precedent in the area of Metropolitan Toronto, for instance, where the separate school board encompasses everyone who lives in Metro Toronto; but for some reason or other, even when the new combined large areas were brought in, you still had to live in one of the zones. We do make it easier to establish a zone in the new legislation that we have in the House right now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about equal grants?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Equal grants?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, for grades 9 and 10.

Hon. Mr. Wells: For the present time, grades 9 and 10 are considered as elementary school pupils. It is still our policy and, in the estimates that we have before the House today, we are approving money to pay grants at the elementary school level. Surely you

are not suggesting that those pupils should be paid at a secondary school per-pupil level which includes a full secondary school. We don't have any breakdown of academic, commercial and technical any more. We have one grant that covers secondary school pupils in a secondary school and that covers the whole range of programmes from grade 9 to 13. Surely that isn't the grant that would apply to the 9s and 10s in this particular area.

Mr. Foulds: Why not?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I just want to return to this concept that the minister has enunciated, that he is fostering sharing of facilities wherever possible and that he has tied this statement to assurances to anyone who will listen that it is not part of some nefarious scheme to corporate the separate school system in the public system even in those communities where the separate school supporters far outnumber the others. If, in fact, they are going to end up sharing facilities in some communities, then surely they ought to receive grants at precisely the same level. I can't understanding the minister's justification for continuing something that may have been rooted in the prejudices of the past. It seems incredible that he would try to justify it on that basis.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The separate school people have not asked us for grants at the secondary school level.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth wanted to speak earlier. Go ahead with your question.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I just fail to follow that weird reasoning that the minister just put forward. He said, if I heard him correctly, surely you are not going to suggest that grades 9 and 10 for separate schools should be treated on a basis other than for primary schools. If you treat grades 9 and 10 for the other system of education, other than for primary schools, why don't you treat them that way for separate schools?

How can you possibly equate 9 and 10 with grades 1 to 6? With 7 and 8 maybe, you have got a tenuous argument in places like Metropolitan Toronto, where because of the stubbornness of a certain now deceased director of education out in North York, we have a tri-level system. But let's leave Dr. Minkler to rest in peace and let's move on from 7 and 8 to 9 and 10. How can you possibly put 9 and 10 into grades 1 to 6 and say those grants have to be equivalent and say you are not prejudiced and say you are not treating different people in different ways?

The minister makes no sense at all, and to say that they haven't asked for it, what do you think all the fuss was about? Sure you won the election and sure you got 78 seats and in the combined opposition there are only 39; but are you being fair?

You are not being fair, because when you say we interpret for a certain group of the Ontario community that grades 9 and 10 are the same as primary, but for the rest of the group grades 9 and 10 are secondary, you are just not making any sense at all. I am surprised that this minister, who on many occasions has moments of great intelligence, will get up in the House and say they have never asked for it, and that grades 9 and 10 are really the equivalent of grades 1 to 6. It makes no sense at all.

If you want to be fair don't make the comparison within Metropolitan Toronto.

Did you get your tax bill today? I did. I got my North York tax bill. I don't know whether the hon. minister got his Scarborough tax bill, but we are up to 100 mills on the dollar of assessment. That is what my tax bill is for this year. The summary that the good people of North York sent out to me with my tax bill indicates that the provincial equivalent, on account of roughly $200 million of taxes that are being raised by the borough of North York, is one-third.

It cuts right across the board. It isn't your 60 per cent, or 62 per cent, or what your colleague the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) says is moving up slowly. For Metropolitan Toronto, on this current tax bill, it is one-third. One dollar in every three comes out of the province—but at least it is treated in Metropolitan Toronto evenly across the board.

You leave Metropolitan Toronto, you leave one-third of the population that resides here and go out into the rest of the province and say that you are treating people equally. You are not, and the minister's words do not make it any fairer or any more logical. When he says grades 9 and 10 are the same as grades 1 to 6 it makes no sense at all.

Sure the government decided you weren't going to extend it to grade 13, but at least make it level or fair up to grade 10. You are not doing it. So for goodness sake tell the people. Don't say they didn't ask for it, because that was one of the major agitations

in the last election. You say they are not entitled to it, fine, that is government policy; but don't try to snow us with that kind of phraseology.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Perhaps my statement was misunderstood by you. When I said that they hadn't asked for it, I meant that they never asked us for the total complete per pupil secondary grant that is paid to public schools.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That can't be true?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well it is.

Mr. Foulds: When they ask you tomorrow morning, what is your answer going to be?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, no; it is true! They are presently in the process of supplying us with this information. They said that somewhere between the present elementary school grant and our secondary school per pupil grant, there is perhaps a grant that applies to their grades 9 and 10, because obviously their grades 9 and 10 don't cover the whole programme that we find in our comprehensive 9 to 13 schools.

Mr. Singer: You wouldn't let them.

Hon. Mr. Wells: All I am telling you is exactly what they have asked. This is exactly what they have said. They haven't come to us and said, "Pay us at the secondary school grant rate."

Mr. Haggerty: They may tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They have put forward certain propositions to us at a point somewhere in between. At this point in time we haven't had the chance to verify these. They are presently being submitted to us. I haven't had a chance to look at them yet. But they have come to us and said that somewhere in between there is a per pupil cost that perhaps should apply to their grades 9 and 10, and that is what we are looking at.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, surely we are not going to accept that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well ask your friend—

Mr. Singer: There was a fellow around here named Leslie Frost who used to stand up and—very successfully politically—defend the rights of the public school system, to get the only official grants that were going, and the rest sort of had to follow along in public. Then he toured various sections of the province and by some peculiar method of reasoning—and he was the boss, he was the sole boss, the equivalent of your boss at the moment—he used to dole out money. I suspect that he went around with a great suitcase and sort of doled out the thousands of dollars that were paid along the way. And he kept the whole situation quiet.

Now we came along to your leadership campaign, and there were a variety of opinions, and eventually your present leader won out. He said there was not a penny for anybody and he fought an election on that and he won. But the fact is that you pretended at least that up to grade 10 you were giving equivalent grants. And for the minister to stand here this evening and say, "We never understood," and "They never requested," is just an amazing statement, really, to come from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am just telling you the truth.

Mr. Singer: Well you are not, you are not. You are telling us what the sham was over the many years. You are telling us that those people made such a tremendous issue, and some of us supported them, and the people of the province by and large didn't support that point of view, at least in the return of members to this House, and you won. You are telling us really that there are two standards, and that grade 10 for separate schools means something different from grade 10 for public schools, and that because there wasn't a specifically worded request they shot the whole bundle—a lot of us shot the whole bundle for extending it through grade 13. When he says grade 10 means different things for different people, it is a sham and a falsehood.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, through you Mr. Chairman, that if the minister really believes that that is a principle that has been established, and the only reason he hasn't changed it is because he hasn't had an official request, I don't understand the mentality of the minister. The minister is most peculiar. Surely grade 10 in a separate school is the same as grade 10 in a public school.

And when you leave grade 6—and you rationalize, as you will grades 7 and 8, the junior high—when you leave grade 6, and you get into those higher grades, the costs are equivalent.

The government policy is "Nothing beyond grade 10." Fine. You won an election on that. Surely there was no rationalization that

you can justify in this House tonight, or you can justify to the people of Ontario, that says it is different. You tell us that the people haven't requested it? Surely the minister knows better than that? He must know better than that.

Is he really implying that youngsters in grade 9 and 10 in separate schools are costing less than youngsters in grades 9 and 10 in the other schools? He can't. Now, explain it please, and don't wait for formal briefs. If the minister means what he is saying and it is equivalent to grade 10, then for goodness sake reflect it in your estimates; and if you don't, if you say it is different, and those youngsters who go to separate schools deserve less, then say that. At least be honest enough with the people of Ontario who send their youngsters to school, to say that we have one system of grants for public schools and another for separate schools.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are moving on from that and we are having an academic discussion about what perhaps should be done. All I am saying to my friend is that I have had discussions with various groups and they have not asked for the secondary school grant. They have suggested that there is some in-between course. I didn't suggest this, they suggested it to me. They are to present to me certain statistical data to point out just exactly what might be some in-between grant that could be paid to these 9 and 10 pupils. I didn't devise this, the separate school people themselves have put forward this idea.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just let me ask one question: Doesn't the minister have a secondary grant that is payable to a student who is registered in an academic course, and another grant for a student who is registered in a technical course? They all get precisely the same amount. Certainly it was always brought home to us in previous estimates that the cost at least, whether the grant was different, but the cost per pupil depended on what the registration of the course was, and I know it got very high indeed for certain academic courses, but that it should be relatively easy to calculate an equivalent grant for an academic course for the separate schools which normally do not have the technical and shop training.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, this is what I am getting at. For the last three years, there have not been separate ceilings or per-pupil costs or special arrangements for grants in the secondary panel. They have all been based on one that has been averaged out over the total programme and called the secondary schools per-pupil cost.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But those costs—you must know what those costs are. They must be readily obtained.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well I suppose if we were to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You must have figured them out three years ago.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We don't ask for them separately.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You have got more people and more computers now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The ceiling is $1,100 and that is an average for a total programme, including vocational, commercial and academic in a public secondary school.

Mr. Deans: You would almost be inclined to think that no one in the House realized up until tonight that there was less paid to grades 9 and 10 in the separate school system, listening to the debate. I think everyone understood that there was considerably less paid on a per-pupil basis and everyone, most people, not everyone, but most people have said a number of times that they believed that to be wrong, that in fact there should be an equivalent amount paid. I think the Leader of the Opposition is absolutely correct in saying it ought not to be difficult to determine what grant is paid to the public separate schools, those pupils in the academic courses, in order to determine what equivalent grants should be paid to the separate school courses.

The thing that worries me and always has and has never been explained to my satisfaction, is how the department intends to continue to pay these grants if and when, and I presume it is "when" rather than "if", we eventually arrive at a programme where there are no grades and where, in fact, we have a unit system and where children are in a progressive learning system, where they don't categorize them by grades.

How does the minister propose to continue the kind of grant structure he presently has, recognizing both separate and public school needs, when we get to the point where children are perhaps learning in a number of different what had prior to this been known as grades, but now become known as units. How is he going to cope with that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, that has already been done, of course. In our grant regulations this year, we define an elementary school pupil. In these regulations, elementary-school pupil means a pupil who is enrolled in an elementary school and who, at the beginning of the school year, has completed fewer that 10 credits, or the equivalent toward the secondary school graduation diploma, or a pupil who during the summer next, following the completion of 10 such credits, is enrolled in a summer school programme operated by an elementary school board.

Mr. Deans: Am I right in understanding that what is going to happen then is after a pupil has completed the required number of units for public school, he then goes into another unit system in the high-school structure? Is this what the minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Wells: In other words, because we don't have such a thing as grade 9 and 10 any more, this definition is to conform with the new secondary school credits. In other words, he's considered to be in that first year if he has fewer than 10 credits, and if he proceeds into another year or moves along and has fewer than 10 credits, he is still considered an elementary school pupil. Once he gets over the 10 credits in beginning a new year, then he's no longer eligible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No matter what level he is registered in?

Mr. Deans: That's right. No matter where he is.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, no matter where he's registered.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You say there is no such thing as grades? Officially, they are out? It is like the department, it doesn't exist any more?

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They will not die overnight.

Mr. Deans: No matter what you call it, it's still the way they operate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Are you still the minister? Or do we just imagine it?

Mr. Deans: Let me ask, now that we don't have any grades in the secondary school system, how does the minister propose to cope with that rather unique situation in the city of Hamilton where they have separate grade 13 schools? How are we going to get around the payment of grants and the maintenance of the separate facilities and if we continue with a separate grade 13?

Hon. Mr. Wells: You know, there is no real problem with that because the secondary school graduation diploma is a minimum of 27 credits and the honours secondary school graduation diploma which would give you the equivalent of the old grade 13 is six honour credits taken on top of that.

Now, I presume what the city of Hamilton is going to do—or is doing—is once you have got your secondary school graduation diploma you then go on to this particular institution where you will take your honour credits. I think that this is fine and it is the kind of diversity that should be practised.

Mr. Foulds: Only the name has been changed to protect the guilty.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It could be construed as breaking up this continuum of learning; I don't know. I guess it is an experimental programme; it's a programme that is worthy of consideration. I don't know how rigid they are going to be or, when they let pupils in there, whether they have to stay a full year or whether they can complete it in less than a year. It fits in easily with the system.

Mr. Deans: Tell me, why can't you have a system of continuous learning? Why do you want to break it down so that you must have a certain number of units prior to moving from area to area—I don't know what you want to call it—from primary to secondary, and from secondary to intermediate secondary, if you want to call it that, and then to post-secondary?

The purpose of the credit system, as I understood it, was to permit a child to learn at his own rate; to enable him to be learning certain subjects at a higher level than others according to his ability to absorb. It all breaks down when you get to that 27th credit because the child will likely have to spend a full term in each area.

If he gets to the end of what we previously knew to be grade 12 with 26 credits or 25 credits, he is going to have to stay there another year in order to get the additional six credits or whatever the number was you mentioned, before he can get into grade 13 school. It means, in fact, that you break the system down right at the point where he or she is able to progress right

through. They stop dead and have to mark time while waiting to pick up their credits to follow through into another course.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We discussed this quite fully the other day when we were talking about it.

Mr. Deans: I am trying to see how the money fits in.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You see that is one of the disadvantages of that separate school.

Mr. Deans: Sure is.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I see no reason why, if a person has 26 credits and he still has to pick up the one, he couldn't pick that up and start taking some of the honour credits for grade 13. If they are in separate buildings, that may present a problem to him. I don't know how the Hamilton board is going to handle that but in most schools, where the programme is all in one building, I think it will be very easy to handle. The person can move and start into his honour graduation credits and at the same time get the one that he still has to pick up.

Mr. Deans: Here we are now. I happen to agree with you. We are looking at trying to provide the best educational system for the least amount of money. I think that is the intention. We want to provide the very best by way of education and facilities for the lowest amount of money that we can possibly get away with.

We are encouraging in Hamilton something which may well be okay. I'm not about to argue whether or not having all of those children in one school is useful or otherwise. I frankly don't know. I don't have that kind of insight, but I can see a breakdown in the whole purpose and intent of the gradeless system, if you want to call it that.

Here we go, trying to establish an opportunity for the child who has an unusual learning capacity to go through the school as quickly as he can absorb the education, picking up the things that he is slow in as he goes along. He could quite well be well ahead in one subject and a little behind in another. It all breaks down when he's got to move in the city of Hamilton.

I can't help wondering, regardless of the apparent pleasure that having all the children together in one facility brings, what it does to the financing of it. I often wonder why the department hasn't discussed with the Hamilton Board of Education how they intend to incorporate a programme that will make best use of the money available without having this overlap that we suspect may occur, but which we are not sure about. I am a little concerned that I think this is now the fourth year in Hamilton—it may be more—after the fourth year of a grade 13 facility that the minister isn't able to tell me how the Hamilton board intends to cope with it. They must have come across it; they must have come in contact with that very problem. It's got to be costing us more money, and that's what worries me.

It has got to be costing us, the taxpayers, more money to provide that system, and I want to know how it is that we justify that additional expense at that end when we are cutting down at other ends. When we are talking in the city of Hamilton about not increasing the teachers on the board but rather we are going to eliminate teaching positions by way of retirement and the like.

We make moneys available under vote 2203, item 3, for the provision of financial assistance to school authorities, money for which we really ought to be asking for justification of the spending of it. I'd like to ask the minister how the board in Hamilton have justified to the minister and his department the setting up of two separate grade 13 facilities—and they call them grade 13 facilities—when we are moving rapidly away from the graded system to a progressive learning system, with the unit to be the basis of calculation. The two things are, to say the least, not compatible.

There must be some way that the minister can explain to me how we fit this in and how we get the most for every dollar that we spend.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I think that under this vote we are voting the amounts of money that we pay in grants for all the pupils, and the pupils in all those schools, be they in individual schools or in regular secondary schools in Hamilton, are entitled to the grant. The Hamilton board has prepared its budget and submitted it in the normal way, and therefore we are voting the grant for those pupils.

Now whether they have separate schools or the traditional system of a secondary school, that's up to the Hamilton board. They haven't in any way violated any of our regulations or Acts, and it's part of the diversity that the local board can practise. They elect members to the Hamilton Board of Education, and if the people of Hamilton are dissatisfied—

Mr. Deans: No, it isn't.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, but if they are dissatisfied—

Mr. Deans: Oh, I am not interested in the autonomy bit.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, but I think that some of the trustees in Hamilton are very keen on this particular issue and a lot of them are staking a lot on it. Now if they believe this, and what they are doing is not violating any of the legislation that we have, I can't offer an opinion as to whether it will be good or bad.

Mr. Deans: I want to talk with you about whether or not they are violating it. I'm not absolutely sure that you are right. I ask you, if in fact the facilities were in one school, if the high school system provided for all 33 units of education—I think that's the number you were talking about—then the child could go through the 33 units at his own pace. There would be no delay for any child throughout that system. But if in fact that child ends up at unit 25 and must remain for the total calendar year in that building in order to qualify to get the two additional units that he needs to get his ordinary high school leaving certificate or whatever you call it, he has then wasted a third of the year since the average child does three units in a year. That means we are paying a third more for that pupil to stay in that school during that year, because he can't transfer halfway through the year. He can't move from the one school facility in March to the other school facility downtown, which provides him with the opportunity of six additional units by your statement earlier—and I'm not sure about the units.

This is where I'm asking whether or not there is not a violation, if in fact a child takes four years normally to complete 27 units or the four-year course that we previously had, and if it is possible for that child to progress through the system without stop, hesitation, or whatever you want to call it, right through to the end of what would normally have been the fifth year. But by this system, because he must physically transfer himself from one school to another, all of his learning in a number of subjects ceases while he makes up the ones he is lagging in, in order to get his extra unit.

Then in fact he does cost us more money. They remain there. Let us say, for example, they are teaching eight subjects, and in five of the eight subjects the pupil has completed the curriculum, but in the other three subjects the pupil requires additional tutoring. He must continue on in that particular grade or unit. In order to complete it for part of the following year, he must stay there for the full year. He can't go to the other school then. The other school can't take him because he has got to start at the beginning in each school.

This is what I am saying to you. I am not sure that they are not violating the terms of the Education Act. I'm not sure that there isn't an expenditure of funds which is unnecessary by virtue of this kind of a breaking up of the system. I suppose at some point you might say to me that the same thing occurs in the transfer from grade 13 into university, and I suppose that may well be true. But we don't vote on that in this instance.

But I would like to know from the minister whether there has been an investigation conducted in the area to determine whether or not we do spend in excess of what we need to spend if there had been one continuous flow of education right through to grade 13?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, since we don't really in fact practise centralized control here, as some had suggested we might, I would be glad to talk with the Hamilton people and find out about this. I would have no way of knowing tonight just how they would handle this situation. It is within their domain and I am sure that by talking to Gordon Price or some of their people we can find that out. But I have no way of telling you, except that I am sure there is probably provision to prevent the kind of thing that you are suggesting. I'll have to talk to them and find out about it.

Mr. Deans: Yes, I would appreciate that.

Another thing that has always aggravated me was brought to my attention by one of my colleagues, and I have often wondered about it. We have a veritable palace in the city of Hamilton—it would be fit for the Shah of Iran. It sits on Main St. and is called the Education Centre.

It is without a doubt the most glorious facility one has ever viewed. It has huge entranceways, lovely pillars, great beautiful marble front. It is a marvelous building, obviously extravagant, expensive, and I really wonder at the expenditure of tax dollars on that kind of facility.

I say to the minister, in his looking at

ways to cut corners—and we're all looking at ways to cut corners—I realize that you are not going to be able to do very much about the place in the city of Hamilton. But I am going to tell you that if ever a king decides to settle in Canada that would be a suitable living accommodation for him.

Nevertheless if in future any board of education comes forward to the province with a proposal to build an education centre, I ask you to pay more attention to the kind of facility that is being constructed than obviously was paid to the facility that is constructed in the city of Hamilton. Words can hardly express the grandiose appointments of that building. It is a palace. I suggest to you that it is a palace that we could well have done without. We might have been able to save a buck or two and maybe we wouldn't be cutting back here and there. In any event that is something for future consideration. Take a look more closely at what is being proposed by way of building facilities. I don't care which taxpayer pays it or through whose channel it comes. I make that point to you.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is all at the local level—

Mr. Deans: I agree. I am not blaming the minister.

I think it is fair to say that I wasn't pointing the finger at you. I'm simply asking you that when there is a discussion, as there ought to be between the county board and the department, about expenditures for the year and the approval of budgets and the like, I really do think that it wouldn't be a bad idea to take a look at the amounts of money to be spent on such things as future building projects.

When you say it is a local responsibility you may well be right. It always amuses me, in a funny way, when we open a new building in Hamilton and Dr. Price stands up and says: "On behalf of the Minister of Education, I declare this building open."

I am always interested in how he gets the authority to get up on behalf of the Minister of Education and declare the building open. The only day he didn't do that, by the way, was the day that your deputy was there. And you know, Dr. Price was taken aback by the fact that he was asked to get up and say that; but he did.

On a serious note, I do think that they are a mite extravagant with the taxpayers' money. I would like to hear from you at some subsequent time how they intend to cope with the problem I raised about the continuous flow of education through the system. I don't know how they are going to do it; but they are wizard enough to manage to fit it in somewhere, I am sure.

The other thing I was going to say to you, perhaps a mite facetiously, is I very much doubt if you will get a one-humped camel from the separate school board.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We want something better than that.

Mr. Deans: They might consider it to be a pig in a poke.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask of the minister if the credit system was only being used in the case of the separate school system? It is not used in the public school system on the elementary level, is it?

Mr. Deans: Credits? Yes!

Mr. B. Newman: Credits.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It isn't specifically for the separate school system. The provision has always been there for public schools to have grades 9 and 10 in the elementary schools too; but none have it at this point in time.

Mr. B. Newman: Is it the 9 and 10 of the public—I shouldn't say that. I'll forget about that.

Earlier in the year, I asked the minister if he was going to resolve the problem with the separate school boards concerning the student with 10 credits now being considered a grade 11, or the equivalent of a grade 11 student; and he would no longer be eligible for any type of grant once he received 10 credits. Has that problem been resolved?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is the definition that I just read, Mr. Chairman, and at this point in time that definition sticks with this year's grant regulations. We've asked the separate school trustees group to come in and talk to us about it. They have made some presentations and we are carrying on dialogue about it.

Mr. B. Newman: Does the minister not realize that he is penalizing the bright student? A student who, in the course of one year, may be able to obtain 10 credits by getting possibly eight credits, or even nine

credits, during his first academic secondary school year and then taking a summer course. So that a student with only one year in the secondary level, especially in the separate school system, is no longer entitled to receive grants for him, because he would now be considered a grade 11 student; or the equivalent of a grade 11 student in today's categorizing.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think this is a case, Mr. Chairman, where everything has been averaged out. I think that, on balance, this is a fairer definition than perhaps some others that we might have accepted. For instance, we might have said 27 credits for the diploma, grades 9 and 10 are half of the four years so we take half of 27, say, make 14 credits as the cut-off mark. In other words you are eligible for a grant if you have fewer than 14 credits, but once you have more than 14 credits you're not eligible. Whereas, under this system, if you take seven as an average number, coupled with summer school, you could get seven and nine and then you could get nine the next year. You could have as many as 18 credits and still be qualified for grants. Because this not only covers the credits that you take in the second year, if you get into it under 10 credits, but it also accounts for the summer school credits that you might take at the end of that second year.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, but you would not issue to the student with 10 credits a grade 10, or the equivalent of a grade 10 certificate. You will only pay him grants if he has only nine credits. He would fail under the normal system. So don't you think that you should have used at least 14 credits as the break-off point rather than 10 credits?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I think perhaps you are not quite fair. This 10 credits means at the beginning of the school year. In other words—

Mr. B. Newman: He has to have 10. Once he has 10 credits on the elementary separate level he is no longer eligible for grants.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is at the beginning of the year. Now if he has nine or eight at the beginning of the second year he is eligible for a grant then for the whole year.

Mr. B. Newman: Right. He is eligible for grants for the whole year. But the student who has 10 credits wouldn't get any grants, or the system would get no grants for him, because the break-off point is 10. Why shouldn't it be at 14 with him?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, if it was at 14 we would have to follow it through and as soon as he got 14 credits he would be cut off. If he had 15 credits he would then be cut off the grant because he would have half, but as I say we have averaged it here so that there will be students who have 17 and 18 credits and are still getting grants.

We are discussing it with the separate school people but I think that this was an attempt to redefine, as the other hon. member mentioned tonight, an elementary school pupil, since we can't use grades nine and 10. If there is any problem with it, any really serious problem, we will be sitting down and looking at it, but it all has to be averaged out and this is the kind of study that we will be doing.

Mr. B. Newman: It does apparently cause a real serious problem, or the separate school people wouldn't be concerned about it. The break-off point being the 10 credits certainly is a real problem to them. That student with 10 credits certainly wouldn't be considered a third-year student, he would only be considered a second-year student. He would get no certification stating that he had completed two full years of schooling in the separate school system.

I'd like to go to another topic and that is concerning the revenue per pupil available. Now according to the figures that I have, in the public system the average grant or average cost revenue available for a student in either the academic or technical, averaging them off for the year 1970—and that's the last year that figures were available to the party who did this studying—was $1,251. Now on the separate school level the grant for that year, or the revenue available, or if you wish to call it cost revenue, was $663.

So really by providing funds to the separate school system in the grades we call now or we once called 9 and 10 on the elementary level, you are actually short-changing the student in a separate school system going to grades 9 and 10 to the extent of $588 per year. Surely you can't call that equality in educational opportunity? You are giving to one system $1,251 to educate the student, and to another system you are only making available $663.

I'm using 1970 statistics, not 1971 or 1972, but I would think were I to use more updated statistics the difference would be substantially greater than $588 per student. I

can only plead to the minister that he has to make available to the separate school system exactly the same revenue as is available to the public system at times, and I think the department should have statistics available concerning the revenue breakdown for practically every grade. It isn't that complicated with the computerization that is available to the department. If others could figure it out, I would think, with some accuracy, Mr. Minister, your department should be able to do that.

I plead with you to seriously reconsider the provision of financial assistance to the separate school system in grades 9 and 10 to the same extent as it is provided today in the public system.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. B. Newman: Isn't the minister going to respond?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I just responded to that quite fully a few minutes ago.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I can't let this vote pass without having some words to say on the ceilings on school board spending. I've watched with interest during various question sessions in the House, particularly earlier in this session, when various questions were asked of the minister about the constraints that the ceilings on educational spending were placing upon the school boards, and the minister in each case used various arguments, fell back on local autonomy, also saying he didn't think they were causing any hardships.

And when, with various examples, it was pointed out the types of programmes that were being affected; that it would be the programmes in our school systems that would be affected, and nothing else; he sort of implied at least one day, as I recall, that perhaps it was administrators and administrators' salaries that should be cut. He didn't say this outright. But this is what should be cut. I think there is a fair amount of agreement on that.

I know he didn't say that, but when other people mentioned it to him, he smiled quite broadly and with a half-nod even said at one point, I think: "That's your words." But he didn't seem at all displeased with that analysis.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member is putting words into my mouth.

Mr. Bounsall: No, I'm putting half-nods on your shoulders.

Mr. Singer: Maybe if you could put words into his mouth, it would help.

Mr. Bounsall: Well, I wouldn't mind. The member would like to put a few in there too, I think.

Mr. Singer: Right!

Mr. Bounsall: At the same time, you were denying really that there were any real programmes being cut across the province. I know that the member for Port Arthur does have a list—I don't know whether he has used it or not—of programmes across the province that have been cut due to this financial tightness. I can speak of one in the Windsor area public school system. The home economics and the shop or industrial arts programme has been cut out of grade 7 primarily as a result of the ceilings on your school boards' spending.

What this brings to mind is the thought that in future years, if and as this continues, that other "special programmes" will be cut from our educational institutions. To my mind none of these programmes are special except in the sense that they were introduced and got into our system after subjects like reading, writing and arithmetic. I don't classify home economics as special, or industrial arts, or some of the other programmes which are likely to disappear—such as instrumental music, art, enrichment, or remedial reading. This type of programme stands to get cut in future years.

I believe this is the worry in our community as we see small inroads being made on some programmes. I don't have the figures with me for community by community. There are some small studies being made on this, but certainly I can report in the Windsor area that in grade 7—with the facilities available—home economics and industrial arts have been removed.

The teachers teaching those programmes, and specially trained to teach those programmes, are now teaching in the normal classroom situation. No doubt they are qualified for that, but they are not putting their special training to use. I regret this very much.

This is a consequence of the ceilings on the school board spending. It would interest me very much if the minister would have a look and inform the House what will be happening in our schools starting in September, and

on a number of programmes that were offered this past year, but are not being offered now. There were a number of programmes that were proposed to be offered and were not able to be offered because of the ceilings on spending.

Because if we get into another year of what would be as tight or tighter ceilings on school board spending, we're going to see the disappearance of some of these other very worthwhile, in the minds of the board, special programmes. Not what I would call normal programmes; valuable additions to our curricula in our schools. Programmes which when they were introduced both at the provincial level and at the local level, were highly trumpeted. A lot was made of the introduction and the expansion of the number of options and the number of courses.

The fact is that these courses would now be abandoned slowly as the school board ceilings continue to go on. I would hope that you would, if you don't have some of these figures now, provide them for us next fall, certainly in time for next year's estimates, as we have a look at what would be, therefore, probably a decrease in your legislative grants for the year thereafter.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2203 carried?

Mr. Foulds: Sorry. Just one last point that I'd like to raise—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: —because it occurred to me that the minister managed to neatly sidestep my argument with the story about the dromedary.

The minister has not really come to grips with two points that we on this side think need to be faced up to. That is whether or not we are eroding local autonomy by the strict imposition of the ceilings on educational spending. The other question, the one that my colleague has brought up—we have not really received the categorical assurance from the minister that the quality of education is not suffering because of the possible limitations in developing programmes. I really would like to get the minister on record on those two points.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well yes, Mr. Chairman. On the first point, I certainly don't believe that local autonomy is being eroded by our ceilings on spending. I think that we're being very naive if we think that if we're paying 60 per cent of the cost of education that we're not going to want to have some say in the total amount that is being spent. I think—

Mr. Foulds: You just contradicted yourself.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I don't think so. I'm just saying that I think that local autonomy can still exist, and exist to a great extent, wihin the ceiling limits on the money that we say can be spent. I think that we make a mistake if we think that the only way that we can have local autonomy is to have complete say in how much money we get, what we want to do with it—the sky's the limit, but have someone else provide the money.

Mr. Foulds: No. No. No. No.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm not sure what my friend is driving at then. All I'm saying is that I personally believe that we can still have local autonomy in education. In other words, the school boards themselves still exercise a great degree of local control, even though we have set a limit on the amount that they can spend. I don't see a contradiction there, although I realize some people do. I think that's the kind of control of total spending that we have been asked to implement and that we have implemented. But within that there are plenty of opportunities for local expressions of local autonomy and that—

Mr. Foulds: Give me some examples.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The school boards—

Mr. Foulds: Contradict my statement that the limitation of money does not affect policy decision-making.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Take the Hamilton board. There's one example. The Hamilton board has decided that it is going to segregate grade 13 into two schools. It is probably the only place—

Mr. Foulds: That decision was made before the limitations—

Hon. Mr. Wells: But I mean they still can do that and they have not seen fit to cancel that decision. That's the kind of local decision they can make.

Other school boards in this province are establishing different types of schools. Take the illustration that our friend from Windsor just illustrated. Perhaps in the eyes of the Windsor Board of Education, they feel that manual training and home economics to grade 7 are not of sufficient value to keep in there.

Mr. Bounsall: They couldn't make money ends meet.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There's a great danger, and this is the kind of process that ceilings bring about. There's a great danger to believe that everything you're doing is right and good, and it has a purpose and it's very necessary. And when you don't have to worry about the amount of money you're spending, you don't evaluate and you don't try to decide whether something really is worthwhile.

To a great degree our educational system over the last 10 years has gone through this process where the sky's the limit. If you want to build a fancy education centre, you build it, as my friend from Hamilton said, or if you want to do something else, you do it, or you want to put this kind of a programme in, you do it. There was no worry about money so you never really thought whether it was really doing what it was supposed to do, or you never looked back and evaluated it.

Well, what has happened now is that because there is a ceiling on the increase in expenditure, it has kind of put the brakes on it and you have got to look back at everything you are doing. We are in that intermediate process now, and this is the key, I think. We have only had the ceilings for about three years. We are now going to carry on these kinds of studies. We will look at what's happening in Windsor. We will look at what's happening in Hamilton and Metro Toronto and every place and we are going to have to study and see what has really been happening and then see where we go from here. But the point is we have caused boards and everybody within, I think, the limits of their own local autonomy, to stop and look and to evaluate their programmes and I think that this was necessary after the kind of expenditures we have had in the last 10 years.

Now, that's our policy and as you know we have ceilings for next year announced and there will be ceilings in 1973.

Mr. Foulds: Okay, we will give you one more year to prove it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, let's see. But I tell you it takes a process like that, after years of unlimited spending, to have people turn and look at themselves and try to evaluate what they are doing. I just don't believe everything that is being done in every school board has necessarily proved worthwhile, but the trouble is that in the kind of an atmosphere we are in now, as soon as anything is cut out, it is listed and someone says, "Gee, that shouldn't be cut out because we think it was good," but it may have been away down the list of priorities and it may not have any particular value in the system. And that's the process we are going through now.

I suppose really only in the last couple of years have we gone through the really strenuous ceiling procedures; so let's see what happens in that period. But certainly that's my philosophy.

I also might say that I share in anything that's been said here about the authority of the local trustees. I think that they must assume the political authority for what goes on in their boards and if they aren't doing this and if an administrator is running a board, it is because these people have abdicated their responsibility.

Mr. Foulds: Not entirely. That is unfair.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If it is not that they have abdicated their responsibility then, I think it is incumbent upon those administrators to realize that these people have been elected to carry out this job of managing education in their jurisdiction, that it is an important job, and they should share the responsibility with them.

I would certainly hope that there are no administrators in this province who wouldn't share any information that a board has with any of the elected trustees. I certainly, when I was an elected school trustee, would have been very disturbed if anyone on the Metro school board or the local board had not given me any reports or any piece of information that I wanted, and I certainly hope that that feeling isn't prevalent now.

I know you read that long story about the Aston Villa experiences and so forth and there are perhaps two sides to everything. I notice somebody has invited me to go up to Aston Villa this year as a guest to partake of some part of that programme and now you have given me a little cause to wonder whether I should attend or not.

Mr. Foulds: I just hope that you carry the philosophy you had as a trustee with regard to board administrators over to your department administrators as well.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, I want to bring up the matter, of course, which I am sure the minister is quite aware of, and that is with regard to the

problems in the Essex county school board and their wish to replace their director of education. I suppose it is rather confusing to a man outside of the legal profession to understand the way it has been going on.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Ruston: This is under county boards of education.

Mr. Chairman: No, no. This is under the grant system, financial assistance to school authorities.

Mr. Ruston: Well, the grant is to the county board of education.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, the grants, yes.

Mr. Ruston: Well, if you don't give them any grant, they don't operate, and I am just saying that the budget for the county of Essex is $20 million so I would say that this minister is allocating I would suppose $10 million to them, so I would think that that is a fair amount of money, Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me to comment.

Mr. Chairman: I thought you were referring to the dismissal of the director.

Mr. Ruston: I am worried about the situation there because the board did vote to have the director replaced and to this date, it has not received approval of its action from the Minister of Education. I understand the reasoning for the minister not to take action is that the director has issued a writ against the board for unlawfully firing him.

Now the minister mentioned, I think, at some time that he was thinking of changing the Act to put into it that one of the reasons for being fired would be incompatibility with the board of education, and also that the Act might be changed so that one director could leave one place and go to another.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. You know that dismissing the director of education should have come under 2201 in the general administration of the minister's office? We are strictly talking about grants here, assistance to local—

Mr. Ruston: I don't think so.

Mr. Deans: He is saying that we ought not to be paying the salary.

Mr. Chairman: No, that is not what is coming through to me.

Mr. Ruston: I don't think so, Mr. Chairman, because you see you are dealing strictly with the board of education, which is under grants for the county boards; that is why we had to bring it up under this vote here, and that is why I didn't bring it up under 2201. This is strictly a county board of education and the grants go to the county boards.

Mr. Chairman: We are talking about the grant structure, the structure of the grants.

Mr. Ruston: Yes. So the minister must have something on what he intends to do with this. This is very serious and the director is either on salary or not so the minister must become involved in it someplace through financing his administration. I would hope that the minister could give us some idea as to what he is doing on that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, the matter is before the courts and I would rather not say anything on it right now.

Vote 2203 agreed to.

On vote 2204:

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2204. There are two main items here: item 1, Ontario schools for the deaf, and item 2, programmes in Ontario Hospital schools. The member for—

Mr. Ruston: Called a yellow minister, I think. Gutless minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nickel Belt. On item 1?

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, yes.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Something under your seat there?

Mr. Ruston: No. There is nothing under his seat. There should be something put under it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nickel Belt, yes.

Mr. Laughren: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time the grant for schools for the deaf—in particular I will talk about the one at Belleville for the moment; I believe that the grant there is in the neighbourhood of $6,000 per student. The cost, and that of course includes residence at the school —but there are other schools for the deaf across the province—I am thinking now of the classes for the deaf that may be held in schools, for example, and that the grants

there, I believe, are regular elementary school grants.

What is completely beyond me is how you can provide a grant for a class or school which teaches children who are hard of hearing and pay that school the regular grant for elementary school students when in fact, according to your own officials, the cost of providing the education to those students is in the neighbourhood of $3,000 – between $2,500 and $3,000 – and I wonder if you could explain why you have such a discrepancy in the two rates?

The second part of my request is that in all of northern Ontario—I stand to be corrected on this—there is a class for the deaf in Sudbury, the hard-of-hearing at least, but for example, if a student is in Thunder Bay and that student needs to be trained because he is hard of hearing, he must go all the way to Belleville. He can't even go to Sudbury because there are no residences there. I am not suggesting that there should be residences there because I think that is something you should be getting away from and that there should be more of the classes offered throughout the province for the hard-of-hearing students. For example, if a student has to travel 50 or 75 miles, then perhaps—I know there should be a transportation allowance made for the students.

Mr. Chairman: Carried?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, first of all I think, Mr. Chairman, it should be understood that last year's cost at the school for the deaf, which was $5,800, is not a comparable cost to a cost under the local board. This is an all-inclusive cost, including 24-hour supervision, residence and extra staff, the whole works; because they are living in a residential setting. The hon. member is quite right. A child from northern Ontario who is deaf, would go to Belleville. If they are hard-of-hearing there are classes in Thunder Bay and in Sudbury. But if they are deaf, they would go to the school in Belleville.

Mr. Laughren: Am I correct in my assessment of the cost to the board of educating a student who is hard of hearing—is it in the neighbourhood of $2,500 to $3,000?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, that is all built into the total cost. I really don't have that cost here except that I know that in Metropolitan Toronto, where they wish to have their own facility, it certainly is more than the normal cost. And that's why we allowed them to take that out of the ordinary expenses, which were included in the ceiling, and included as an extraordinary cost, completely taxable on the local ratepayers. This is what Metropolitan Toronto wanted to do; have their own school for the deaf here. So that actually the cost is more. I don't have the exact figure, but it certainly is more and I think it was something like nearly $800,000 that was moved out as an extraordinary expenditure in Metro.

Mr. Laughren: Just to pursue that a moment—

Hon. Mr. Wells: That was for the deaf and for the orthopaedic school.

Mr. Laughren: Well, are you saying then that when the school board, such as the one in Sudbury, has a class—I think there are about 21 students in the class in the school in Sudbury—that if it costs almost $3,000 to train each student; and that there are no special grants unless it is absorbed by the municipality by the local taxpayer? Is that what you are saying? There are no special grants for that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, there are the special education weighting factors, and so forth. It's all considered as part of the total special education weighting in the grants and ceiling regulations.

Mr. Laughren: Then the local school board is not being penalized because of the extra cost in training those hard-of-hearing students? Is that what you are saying? Because that is not what they are telling me.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't think it is, no.

Mr. Laughren: You don't think what?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I don't think it is being penalized because it is providing for those hard-of-hearing students.

Mr. Laughren: It does get extra grants?

Hon. Mr. Wells: There is a weighting factor for that and it is part of total special education.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on either item 1 or item 2?

Mr. Foulds: Just two brief comments, because I think we all want to wrap this up this evening.

I believe that the former Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) made a commitment during the discussion of the estimates last year, to the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel).

He said he would look into this question brought up by my colleague from Nickel Belt about the possibility of providing, particularly in northern areas, the grants necessary to keep the children with these particular learning disabilities in areas relatively close to home; so they could get home more often. The kid, after all, is under a double handicap if he has to come down to Belleville. He misses his natural peers in his home situation, by being away from home; and he has the physical learning disability. And I would like to know if the former minister or the present minister acted on that promise to investigate and to consider this problem, and what the conclusions were?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, yes, we have certainly acted upon the commitment to study the problem and it has been actively looked at. It was assessed that there would probably be about 140 students involved in this area between the ages of five and 20. But as I understand from the study, it became apparent that no matter where such an institution or school, I should say, was located, it would still be a great distance from a lot of those students' homes. Granted, it wouldn't be as far as Belleville is, but it would be a great distance away.

There were still a lot of problems with this kind of thing, so we really haven't come to any conclusion. It might be that there would be 50 to 75 who, if we put it in a certain place, would be within a reasonable location. This perhaps would not be enough to establish a really viable school, such as we have at Belleville.

All I can really say is that we will have to continue looking at this to see if there is a solution. But that is the result of our studies to date.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2204—

Mr. Foulds: I have a particular case that I would like to discuss with the minister outside the House—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Personally at a later date.

Mr. Foulds: It is about a constituent who is both blind and mentally retarded. That seems to apply to institutions—perhaps we could discuss that at some other time, Mr. Chairman.

Vote 2204 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the study of the estimates of the Ministry of Education.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue. I would expect that sometime before Thursday, either the Premier (Mr. Davis) or myself will outline the balance of the legislative programme in the House.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 5, 1972

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, concluded 3207

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 3233

No. 82



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have many visitors with us today in our galleries. In the east gallery are students from Nakina Public School of Nakina, in the west gallery students from Glendale School of Simcoe, and the Simcoe East Progressive Conservative Association of Midland. In both galleries we have students from Darcel Public School of Malton and in the Speaker's gallery the Progressive Conservative Association women's group of Brantford. Also, at 3 o'clock, we will be joined by students from the Palmerston Public School of Toronto hosting the Grandview Public School of Bethany.

Statements by the ministry.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SUCCESSION DUTIES

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the House that we are establishing a special committee to undertake a thorough examination of the existing Succession Duty Act.

The commitee will be known as the Advisory Committee on Succession Duties. It's membership will be composed of the following:

J. Alex Langford, QC, Chairman; Elmer D. Bell, QC; J. Albert Brule, QC; Wolfe D. Goodman, QC; John Hodgson, QC; R. Bredin Stapells, QC—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The minister has invited all his friends. Give them a job in the liquor store.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Frederick S. Mallet, CA—The hon. member ought to be careful; he's starting to reflect on some of his own friends who are on this list.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Elmer Bell is my friend.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He does have a few friends left, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker.

Garfield P. Smith, FCA; Henry N. R. Jackman, insurance company executive; Reginald L. Kayler, QC; S. Sheldon Taerk, CLU; Terence M. Russell PhD; Derek W. Rowsell; D. Lyall MacLachlan, BSc; A. John Cheney, CA; and Isaac Stephenson, CGA, executive director.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What is the quorum?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The terms of reference—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Don't bother with the terms of reference, what are the per diems?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The terms of reference are: (a) Make a comprehensive review and thorough examination of the presently existing Succession Duty Act; (b) inquire into and report to the Minister of Revenue upon the implication of the impact of succession duties on the family farm, family business and on Canadian vs. foreign control of business;—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia); That will be an objective evaluation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —(c) inquire into and report to the Minister of Revenue upon the relationship between succession duties and the present exemptions relevant to charitable, cultural, educational—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: With that bevy of Tories? Or is it a gaggle of Tories? It's a payoff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and religious organizations; (d) consider and report to the Minister of Revenue a better means of raising from the death and gift tax fields, an amount of revenue equal to the yield from current legislation; (e) advise the Minister of Revenue on our revision of the present Succession Duty Act; (f) examine and report to the Minister of Revenue upon the relationship between the administration of the Succession Duty Act and the Surrogate Courts Act, with the objective of avoiding duplication of cost in the administration of related statutes; (g) inquire into and report to the Minister of

Revenue upon the implication of the impact of succession duties and gift taxes on the concentration of wealth in Ontario, and the investment in Ontario resources; (h) inquire into the effects on the maintenance of a healthy climate for continued growth in Ontario by reason of the nature of the intention of other provinces to withdraw or remain out of the succession duty and gift tax fields.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Start off in Edmonton.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the quorum on that mini-convention?

WATERLOO REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief statement about the proposed Waterloo regional government, particularly in reference to Beverly township. On May 26, I wrote to the Reeve of Beverly township, and the interested municipalities and school boards, indicating that our studies had led us to the conclusion that approximately 42 square miles should be detached from Beverly and form part of the new municipality of North Dumfries.

Since that time representations have been made by the township, by residents, by Hamilton and Wentworth, and most particularly by the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Ewen).

I have accordingly considered this whole matter again and have asked my parliamentary secretary, the member for York East (Mr. Meen) and my staff to change the legislation to coincide with the generally agreed boundary change encompassing some 12 square miles. I have accordingly suggested to the Premier (Mr. Davis) that the meeting with him on Thursday, requested by Beverly township, through the member for Wentworth North, is no longer necessary at this time.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): How about the demonstration?

NEW TORONTO AIRPORT

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, as many members will recall, the government has stated on several occasions, both inside and outside this House, that, while the decision to build a second international airport for the Toronto area was a federal government decision the government of Ontario played a major role in the process of selecting that site.

In order to clarify the nature of that role, and to explain how that decision was arrived at, I would like to table a collection of provincial documents compiled during the course of that decision-making process, which took place over a period of approximately four years.

There are 10 documents in all. Nine of these produced at various times during the four-year period, illustrate the thorough and systematic manner in which our provincial specialists, operating in close co-operation with federal experts, surveyed potential solutions to the problem of Toronto's future needs for air transportation facilities, and step by step helped provide the data and other observations upon which the cabinets of our two governments ultimately based their decision to build the airport in Pickering township.

The 10th document performs a most essential function, that of explaining the context or frame of reference in which each of the other nine documents was produced, and of relating the substance of and the reasons for the policy decisions that were made at various stages.

I would like to suggest that members who wish to study these documents begin by reading this explanatory paper entitled, "The Ontario Government and the Pickering Airport Site," since it emphasizes that none of the other documents can properly be read out of context or be evaluated in isolation from the terms of reference and policy constraints within which it was produced.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Like a hole in the head, there.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nor would a separate reading of these nine other documents, or any selection of them, provide a reader with an appreciation of the policy decisions, which for obvious reasons do not appear in the technical reports.

On the other hand, if these technical documents are read with a proper appreciation of their contexts, I am confident that they will reassure all members of this House and the public at large that this most difficult decision was arrived at by a most painstaking and conscientious process, and with the help of highly talented specialists, well qualified to undertake such a task.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That doesn't stop them from being wrong.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These documents show, Mr. Speaker, that the choice of the Pickering site was made only after careful study and consideration of the factors that could conceivably affect the safety and convenience of air passengers travelling in and out of the Toronto area or could conceivably have some impact on the well-being of the people of this community.

These documents demonstrate the degree of consideration given not only to such obvious questions as the future growth of air passenger traffic and various costs associated with each potential site, but also the social, ecological and environmental impact that a major airport would have on each of the sites considered. As well they analyse the long-range benefits that would accrue—or fail to accrue—to the people of the Toronto-centred region depending on which site was selected.

I am sure that, as the members of this House read through these documents, they will not be surprised to find that when certain individual factors were assessed, some of our experts appear to have favoured one or another of the sites which were ultimately rejected. Indeed, it would not just be surprising but absolutely astounding if such were not the case. For, as with any other question of enormous complexity, one can safely predict that the experts will inevitably voice some negative observations about any choice or solution, and in that sense there is no such thing as the ideal site for an airport—and there never will be.

Nevertheless, this government and the federal government agree that the Pickering site comes closer to the ideal—

Mr. Sargent: Not a single Air Canada pilot will agree that is the site.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It comes closer than any other site that was considered or could conceivably be proposed to serve the needs of the Toronto region from now until the beginning of the 21st century.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize how delighted we are that the Pickering airport decision is a step in the implementation of the Toronto-centred region plan. I hope that all members of the House appreciate that our decision to create a new community in association with the new airport represents a unique step in long-range community planning. Those who have reviewed our plan for the Toronto-centred region already appreciate that the new community of North Pickering, far from representing a departure from our original strategy, constitutes an intensification and acceleration of this long-range regional programme and offers a unique opportunity for Ontario to create a community more exciting and attractive than we previously envisaged.

With those prospects in mind, and with the confidence that Pickering presents the safest, most convenient and, in the broadest sense of the term, the least costly solution to the airport problem, I invite the members of this House and interested members of the public to inspect the documents that I am now tabling.

These documents will be available at any hearings of necessity that may be held, and no doubt some members here will also have questions to ask about them. These can be dealt with best, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, during the presentation of my ministry's estimates to the House.

Mr. Sargent: The minister is the biggest joke of the year. It's typical of what he's doing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ARNPRIOR POWER STATION

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, last October, following the completion of an analysis by the engineering department of Ontario Hydro, the chairman of the commission, Mr. George Gathercole, announced that, subject to certain assurances, construction of a new generating station on the Madawaska River at Arnprior could proceed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What was the date of that announcement?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: About Oct. 9 or 10.

The chairman pointed out at that time that one of these assurances was that the project would have the blessing of the province. I am pleased to report to the House that the government has now given the commission approval to proceed with this important development.

Mr. Bullbrook: How does the province give its blessing?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The announcement today underlines the increasing degree

of consultation and co-ordination involving the commission and those in government who must assess the implications of its decisions —in this case, the environment, water resources management, recreation and agriculture.

Although the technical and engineering particulars will be made available by Ontario Hydro, I can report that the Arnprior generating station will cost approximately $60 million.

Construction will commence late in 1972 or early 1973, and the completion can be expected by mid-summer or early fall of 1976. The project will, at peak times, employ some 700 persons.

Chronic problems of erosion on the Madawaska, upstream of the plant, will be eliminated. A lake about 10 miles long from Arnprior and extending to the Stewartville generating station will be created and provide a valuable new recreational resource for the Arnprior area.

TOBERMORY FERRY SERVICE

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the members of the House that my ministry has recently reached agreement with the government of Canada regarding the introduction of a new ferry service between Tobermory and the Manitoulin Island port at South Baymouth.

The new service will involve an estimated expenditure of $8.8 million to provide a new 110-car ferry; dock construction at both terminal points; extended parking facilities; channel dredging and deepening of the harbour at Tobermory.

The new ferry will replace the two boats now operated by the Owen Sound Transportation Co. which have a combined capacity of 84 cars. In addition to increasing the vehicle-carrying capacity, the new service will reduce the crossing time to two hours from the present three.

Construction of the terminal facilities will get under way as soon as possible after design work has been completed. It is estimated that $1,530,000 will be spent on parking facilities, dock extension, property, and harbour deepening at the Tobermory site, and $1,525,000 at the South Baymouth site. In addition, $1.3 million will be required for channel deepening and channel clear-out operations to serve the new South Baymouth terminal.

Under the terms of the agreement, the federal government will contribute $3 million toward the cost of renovating the facilities at Tobermory and South Baymouth and provide their normal shipbuilding subsidy toward the cost of the new ferry. It will also be responsible for the maintenance of the wharf structures and, on completion of the channel deepening by the Ontario government, it will assume the maintenance of the new channel.

Target date for the completion of the work and the introduction of the new service is May, 1974. In the interim, it is expected that the Owen Sound Transportation Co. will continue to provide service subject to subsidization by the government of Ontario and the government of Canada which is shared on a 50-50 basis.

Consultation with local councils and residents in affected areas will begin immediately and every effort will be made to minimize inconvenience to local merchants.

A project of this nature, Mr. Speaker, will not only provide an impetus to our shipbuilding industry but will also create employment in the Bruce Peninsula and Manitoulin Island regions.

U of T GOVERNING COUNCIL

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Lieutenant Governor in Council has appointed the following members to the governing council of the University of Toronto:

For the period July 1, 1972, to June 30, 1975—C. Malim Harding, chairman; William B. Harris, vice-chairman; Sydney Hermant; C. Mackenzie King; Hon. Daniel A. Lang; W. O. Twaits.

For the period July 1, 1972, to June 30, 1974—Peter Newman; Edward Dunlop; Mrs. Marnie Paikin; Mrs. Betty Kennedy; Lynn Williams.

For the period July 1, 1972, to June 30, 1973—John A. Tory; Murray Koffler; Gordon Fisher; W. James D. Lewis; Dr. Anthony Cecutti.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

NEW TORONTO AIRPORT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, further to the tabling of the documents concerning the location of the airport, I would like to ask

the Treasurer if he would give consideration to having a formal hearing of necessity which would, in fact, give all the people concerned with the decision on the new airport an opportunity to express their views after having examined these important documents that were today made public, rather than simply refer to the possibility of such hearings which may or may not concern themselves with the necessity of individual properties?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that. The position of the government has been that there will be hearings of necessity under both the federal Appropriation Act, and undoubtedly under our own when that becomes necessary. We have reason to believe that the federal hearings will occur before our hearings, and we intend to participate fully in those. This is one of the reasons we are tabling the documents today so that they can be well studied and the citizens, or groups who wish to make representations at the hearings will be armed with the facts as we have them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary; really for purposes of clarification. Is it the Treasurer's view that a hearing of necessity can concern itself under our statute and regulations with the necessity of the airport itself, or only with the necessity of specific properties being included in the scheme?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, I am not a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, and I would hesitate to answer that question.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister advise what that pile of documents has cost to date? Secondly, does he know how much the programme is going to cost the Province of Ontario before it is even started?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Premier points out that we would expect to make money out of the land, eventually. Those of us in the House may not be around to see that particular day, but I expect that we will recover the investment that we will make in the land and the services provided to the site.

How much will the documents cost? I wouldn't know. I think we have involved a great deal of staff time in studies on this matter, some of it I suppose directly accounted for; certainly consultants' fees are accounted for. I think I was asked this question on March 1, 1972, the day the announcement was made. I believe I was asked by a lady controller from Oshawa, and I think at that time I said as a guess, and Mr. Jamieson was also guessing, a quarter of a million dollars. I was told later that the figure would probably exceed that on behalf of the two governments; perhaps half a million dollars.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Would the Treasurer undertake to obtain legal opinion either from his department or from the Ministry of the Attorney General so that people in the community and in the province as a whole will know just what the hearing of necessity referred to by the Treasurer might involve? We would hope that it would involve a discussion and decision on the necessity for the programme, not just the inclusion of specific property.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, I doubt very much if that would be included in our hearings of necessity because, as we have indicated on a number of occasions, the decision as to whether there will be a second airport or not was a decision taken by the government of Canada. That particular matter more appropriately would be dealt with in their hearings of necessity.

If the member is questioning whether there should be a second airport or not, and questioning as to whether the federal hearings of necessity provide the vehicle for that discussion, then I would suggest that he should consult with the government of Canada, or his own lawyers, and find out whether that particular question can be satisfactorily dealt with at the federal hearings. But I don't think that they would be part of our hearings.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Just a brief supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. The study tables outlining the road network and rapid transit system to serve Malton airport in the year 2000 suggest two concepts. One involves Spadina, Highway 401, rapid transit, Spadina subway; and the other, Hovercraft along the Hydro rights-of-way. Have those plans been actively canvassed by government? Have the various planning commissions been told of them?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I suggested in the statement that I think it would be very unwise for any of us to try to answer questions or ask questions on nine documents, of which I am told a careful reading would take something like six or eight hours. I certainly don't propose to get into specific answers at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, would the minister advise whether or not he is concerned about the fact that not a single Air Canada pilot in Canada thinks we need another airport? It is a matter of record; they don't want one. Has that been taken into consideration? Does the minister know about that? Not a single Air Canada pilot considers we need another airport.

Mr. Speaker: I think the statements made by the minister cover that.

Mr. Sargent: Does he know that?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, did the minister's experts at any time examine in fact the question of whether the existing airport could serve future needs? In other words, was there any provincial input on that alternative or did the province simply accept the fiat of the federal government all along?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, if the members will examine the documents that have been tabled and what I have referred to as the bridge statement, the 10th document, I think answers to some of these questions will become apparent.

TASK FORCE HYDRO

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Is he aware that the interim report of Task Force Hydro is already in possession of the officials of Ontario Hydro—of the commission?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, in that the interim report of Task Force Hydro is not finalized I find it difficult to understand that the interim report is in the hands of the commission. I have had some very brief discussion with some members of the task force related to the report, and I think I can categorically state to the Leader of the Opposition that the interim report from Task Force Hydro has not as yet been finalized.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary on that matter: Is he not concerned, since rumour has it that the interim report has very far-reaching recommendations pertaining to Hydro, that it not be edited, under any circumstances, by the commission before at least the ministry and, hopefully, the community as well as the members of the Legislature have had a look at it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really don't think it is being considered by Hydro for the purpose of editing. I think one of the very practical aspects of the report that was done—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why would it be in their possession?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —with respect to government organization was the involvement of senior civil servants from within government in the preparation of the report. This led to the ability of this government to implement it far more rapidly and, I think, in spite of some of the difficulties we've had, in a more practical way than would otherwise have been the case.

There is already representation from the commission on Task Force Hydro. While there may or may not be discussions on some aspects of their proposed report, I don't see why this would in any way negate the validity of that report. I think it is important that there be an understanding, an awareness of some of the items being considered. Certainly, from the government standpoint any discussion with Hydro itself would not be in any way adverse, I don't believe, to the final report. As I say, there has been membership from the commission on the task force from the outset.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Wouldn't the Premier agree that while Hydro as well as many other community groups must have a contribution to make to the formation of the views and opinions of the task force, they should surely not be in possession of what may or may not be the final draft of the interim report before it is delivered to the Premier or to this House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't accept that principle. As I say, there was representation not on the basis of making representation to the task force from Hydro; there was actually membership on the task force itself from the commission. In any event, what is in the report was available right from day one to some members of the commission.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the first draft of the interim report was discussed with COGP and rewritten in light of those discussions, how independent is the task force? My second question is that since that

first draft has also been discussed with the OMEA, how far is this discussion going to go before the report is presented to the government or to the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't say how far it is going to go. Certainly, the task force by its very constitution must report through COGP. Task Force Hydro is a sub-committee or a sub-task force of the original committee and it will be COGP which makes the final report to the government and to the members of the Legislature. I think it is quite obvious, since they will be taking responsibility for the report itself coming to us, that they would have an opportunity to discuss it with those who were part of the task force.

To me, this is completely logical and I think it is quite obvious that OMEA has a very vital role in the whole consideration of Hydro. They have been involved really in an ownership capacity and certainly in a policy capacity with Hydro since day one, since Hydro was created.

I would think that the member for York South would be in a better position to criticize the report—in fact, on his past performance I would predict that if there had not been some discussion with OMEA, he would have been the first one to ask why hadn't there been discussion with OMEA in that they are so vitally involved and have something to contribute. Mr. Speaker, what Task Force Hydro and what COGP are attempting to do is to develop a report that is not only viable from the standpoint of any proposed changes in administration but also from the standpoint of a degree of acceptability by those people who are most directly affected.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, if they are in the process of doing this, as I say, on past performance it is something the member for York South would encourage by and large.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, why should the report have to be—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, as I have the floor.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South can have one more supplementary.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Take it esay.

Mr. MacDonald: I'm not uneasy; I've just got to fight to hold what I have got—and if you want to fight, it's okay with me.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: My question of the Premier, without arguing the involvement of the OMEA for the moment, because obviously they are important, is what was the nature of the rewriting that was done by Task Force Hydro after consulting with COGP, which wasn't involved in the study?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Personally, I don't know whether there has been any rewriting. I do know that Task Force Hydro had a preliminary discussion as it relates to their interim report with COGP about 10 days or two weeks ago—I am not sure of the exact date.

Whether in light of those discussions there will be any alterations in the proposal, I am not in a position to comment. I don't know. But I think, Mr. Speaker, there would be some logic as I see it that if Task Force Hydro's report as a matter of policy or principle appeared to be in conflict—which I am not for a moment suggesting it was because I doubt it—but if it were in conflict with some of the other recommendations of COGP, particularly as it relates to government agencies and commissions, there would be some merit in at least trying to develop a consensus.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, it is not in conflict.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am not saying it is in conflict, because I don't know. I was not at the meeting.

Mr. MacDonald: It's a threat to the basic structure of Hydro!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question—

Mr. Speaker: There has been a reasonable number of supplementaries.

Some hon. members: Oh! We only had two.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Premier. Why would he feel that the report of Task Force Hydro should be acceptable to the commission? Surely that's not its aim?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now, Mr. Speaker, I didn't say it should be acceptable. I just said,

once again I think it is logical, at least from my standpoint, that every effort be made to see that there is as great a consensus as is possible within the responsibilities of any task force.

Surely, as I said just a few moments ago, one of the positive aspects of the initial COGP report to the government and to this House was the fact that there were senior officials of government very directly involved. This made it much easier for this government to implement the report, because there was a degree of consensus achieved prior to the final publication. In my view this was one of the very positive aspects of that report. It was something that had not been done in the past—I am prepared to acknowledge this—and to me this is a very excellent way of trying to get a report that is in fact workable.

There is no point in any area of government involvement today, in my view, developing a task force to report on an issue where there hasn't been a high degree of consultation because that could lead to a report that would create more difficulties from a practical standpoint than it would solve.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think one can draw a parallel with COGP and, to me, if there is discussion with the commission, if there is some attempt to rationalize any different points of view—and I don't know that there is—to me this would be commendable.

Certainly I think the members of this House would be much happier with a report coming in from Task Force Hydro that had, shall we say, a degree of general acceptance from those people who are most directly affected. It may turn out that such a report will not emerge. It may turn out that a report will emerge where there isn't the degree of consensus and, of course, then this is something that the government will have to deal with.

Mr. Lewis: Why does the Premier seek a consensus from the object of his investigation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have had a supplementary question from the member for Scarborough West, and I would say to him that if there is any person who has attempted in a rather negative way to say to this government that one should develop a consensus before making a decision it has been the member for Scarborough West—

Mr. Lewis: Me? I asked that? I asked for a consensus from the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as it relates to the very matter that the Treasurer has dealt with in the past few minutes, the matter of the airport. All we have had are questions such as, why were the people not involved, why didn't we attempt to develop a consensus prior to the decision-making process? Well, here we are again—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This is a little different.

Mr. Lewis: This is a little different. That report—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member is contradicting himself in his whole approach to this administration.

Mr. Lewis: Come now, some say I am not even trying—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly, there is no question about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Good: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Good: There have been only two supplementaries, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Further supplementaries on this topic are quite out of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I know the member is trying to reach a consensus in his party, but how is he succeeding?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

STRIKE AT DUNNVILLE PLANT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: What has he done to rescue the calamity for Dunnville with the announced closure and move to the United States of the Lanark Manufacturing Co., subsidy of Essex International Wire Co., and the loss of work for 700 people, 85 per cent of whom are women, the largest female work force in the peninsula?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was anticipating the question from my hon. friend. I have a few notes

here. It's a fact that Lanark Manufacturing is a plant situated in Dunnville and its does employ 700 people, most of them women.

Mr. Lewis: That helps. So far he is okay.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The plant and the union have been negotiating a contract with the help of the conciliation services of our ministry for some time, and one of the major problems is that the plant indicated it would fold its operations in Dunnville if the employees went on strike. Mr. Stevens, of our conciliation branch, attended a union meeting with all the union representatives and Mr. Stevens recommended the acceptance of the contract offer, it was turned down by the membership. The employees went on strike and they are still out, as far as I understand.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That's four days they have been on strike.

Mr. Lewis: With an average weekly income of—

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well that's all right. That's okay. We are still, of course, working. We have called a meeting for tomorrow of all the interested parties and our branch will be represented at the meeting, which is to take place tomorrow in Dunnville. That's where the matter rests now.

Mr. Lewis: Well, let me ask, what advance notice did the minister have from the plant for termination of employment?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, we had no advance notice, and according to legislation there was no notice required by our department.

Mr. Lewis: And what does the minister think about his legislation, which requires no notice for termination during the course of a walkout or strike, so that 700 people lose their jobs without advance notice at all?

Mr. MacDonald: It is a mockery of your legislation. It's Acme Screw and Gear all over again.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The employment standards branch has enforced this legislation over the years, but in the case of a strike the requirements of a notice to the ministry are not required at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary question: Does the minister deem it a violation of that clause in the contract, in reference to bargaining in good faith, if a company says, "If you go on strike we will close up shop"?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well it's not my recollection, Mr. Speaker, that the company did say that.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister just said they would. While on strike they closed the plant down.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

STRIKE AT KITCHENER PLANT

Mr. Lewis: I have a further question of the Minister of Labour. Is the Minister of Labour aware of the serious troubles which have developed in the current strike at Dare Biscuits, I guess it is, in Kitchener?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, Mr. Speaker I am not aware as yet.

Mr. Lewis: He is not aware, I ask interrogatively, of the charges that will today be laid and the alleged finding of Molotov cocktails on the part of the police?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: It hasn't come up to my attention so far.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Well may I, by way of final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, ask the minister to look at the seriously deteriorating situation in the light of the presence, yet again, of Canadian Driver Pool Ltd. and all that means for that labour unrest. When is he going to give us a report on what the investigations into Rick Grange and Canadian Driver Pool have resulted in?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I have answered this question on two or three occasions already. There is an investigation going on, a study by several departments—not only the Ministry of Labour is involved—into this, and as soon as we can give a report we'd be glad to.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Close them down!

Mr. MacDonald: The minister takes a long time to come to grips with a racketeer.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

QUARRYING OPERATIONS ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Natural Resources. How

many permits that were originally granted under the Niagara Escarpment Protection Act have been automatically renewed under the Quarries and Pits Conservation Act?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, the Pits and Quarries Control Act came into force on Jan. 1 and received proclamation which will not come into force until six months later when all the site plans must be filed with my particular department. These are coming in now. I am sorry I don't have the exact figure as to which ones will be accepted or approved under the new legislation. I could get that information for the member.

LAND PURCHASE ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: Good. May I ask the minister in one last question, can he indicate to the House now, based on the material he pulled together for his estimates, which part of the Niagara Escarpment we have purchased, which is identical to that recommended for purchase in the original Gertler report?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out to the hon. member, the Gertler report was accepted in principle only. While the essence of the Gertler report was acquisition, we did look into a broader field and we are not following the Gertler report per se.

Mr. Cassidy: The government waited so long, it can't afford it now.

Mr. Sargent: It isn't?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I did have the information available during my estimates and it is still there available for the member.

Mr. Sargent: So it isn't, eh?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary then, can the minister bring to the House—and it's a very simple question—of the 20,000 acres which he says he had purchased by March 31, 1972 (I think it is 19,800 and something) how many of those acres actually fall within the specific recommendations for acquisition as indicated in the Gertler report? Can that information be brought to the House?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is any purpose in bringing the two together—

Mr. Lewis: Why?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —because it was only accepted in principle. The Gertler report was accepted in principle. To overlay one on top of the other just doesn't make sense because we have gone beyond that.

An hon. member: Ridiculous!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We've taken people into consideration in the acquisition of land, so there is no real direct relationship per se.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Principles don't count, do they?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the minister recall telling us in the estimates that he had an actual overlay map by which he compared the two? Why would he deny the House the simple information of knowing how much of Gertler's original recommendations has been acquired?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I did say that I would provide the hon. member with an acquisition map of what we are doing and I had that information available for him, sir.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that.

An hon. member: The minister doesn't have it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes; we did have it, and we even went so far as to have the matter put into another vote for him to discuss, at which he did not show.

Mr. Lewis: I was not available.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member wasn't available. We're still prepared to give this information, yes. I'll make sure the member gets it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has further questions?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: There have been enough supplementaries. The hon. member for Wentworth North.

HIGHWAY 403 SPEED LIMIT

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. When will the speed limit be increased from 60 to 70 miles an hour on Highway 403?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did the OPP catch the member again?

Mr. Ewen: Not yet.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): We hope never.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, there was an order in council passed on May 8. From the intersection of the Queen Elizabeth Way to Snake Rd., when signed, it is now 70 miles per hour. The district has been informed today and it will be signed shortly. From that point to Snake Rd. it will be 60 miles per hour, and from Snake Rd. through to Duff's Corners, 70 miles per hour.

Mr. Martel: Was that planted?

Mr. Bullbrook: Now there's a minister who can answer questions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill was up first.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There's a member who can ask questions.

Mr. Bullbrook: We don't get the chance, really.

METRO PUBLIC TRANSIT

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Does the minister not think that it is high time that he made a report to this House on the cerebral exercises of the joint technical committee and the joint policy committees which were formed over a year ago on the matter of public transit in Metro Toronto? Have they made any recommendations and, if so, would he please tell us what they are?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, we have been working, as the hon. member knows, for some considerable time. We have some recommendations that have come through from the JTTPC to the policy committee. I have been in touch with the chairman of Metro Toronto. I take the attitude that we work in co-operation with him. There are letters, transmittal letters, going down to the Metro executives from my ministry, in conjunction with the chairman of Metro and the chairman of the TTC, which will deal with—and this will be done this month—such matters as the Scarborough and also the northwest quadrant.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

SUSPENSION OF DRIVER'S LICENCE

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Has the minister had a chance to look into the case of one Garry Key who had his driver's licence suspended as the result of a judgement which was given against him in his absence and without his knowledge, as was reported in last week's press?

Hon. Mr. Carton: If this is the one that is reported in the press, Mr. Speaker—I am not certain of the name of the gentleman—in this particular case he had been represented by a legal aid lawyer. There had been an appearance filed. There had been a statement of defence filed and legal aid, as well as his lawyer, tried to get in touch with him on four different occasions, without success. I have made inquiries as to whether anything further had been done to notify him. There had been an appearance entered and there had been a statement of defence filed by his own lawyer in this connection. I am looking into it to see if anything further had been done.

Mr. Shulman: Will the minister report to us?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I will.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has the answer to a previous question.

ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION DISCLOSURE POLICY

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question earlier this month by the member for York South to which I have a reply. I am pleased to advise him that the Province of Quebec is in essence adopting the same legislation which we have had in effect in Ontario for some years.

The Ontario Securities Commission works very closely with the Stock Exchange, Investment Dealers Association and the Broker-Dealers Association. In order to provide a high standard of accounting and accountability in the securities field, the Toronto Stock Exchange has a very comprehensive surveillance system which calls for periodic checks and surprise visits by the auditing

staff. The Ontario Securities Commission has the power and the staff to duplicate these checks. However, in practice, it becomes involved in only a relatively few cases and in special circumstances.

The new Securities Act, which was introduced for first reading, continues the high standard of financial accountability which we have demanded in the past, and surveillance accountability.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

TASK FORCE HYDRO

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Since the interim report of Task Force Hydro indicates that there should be a complete reorganization of the administrative function of Hydro, that the office of chairman be terminated and Hydro be placed under a senior cabinet minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Good: —would the Premier inform the House—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have covered the matter of the Hydro task force—

Mr. Good: This is an entirely new question.

Mr. Speaker: —with numerous questions—

Mr. Good: This is an entirely new question, Mr. Speaker, with great respect.

Mr. Speaker: A question regarding this report is not proper at this time.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, may I just point out to you that this is an entirely new question, on a point which has not been covered by any other question. There were only two supplementaries regarding the report and this deals with an entirely new issue regarding the interim report by Task Force Hydro.

Now, if I can't—

Mr. Sargent: Why is the Speaker afraid of that?

An hon. member: Feel free.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker isn't afraid of anything. It's quite possible—

Mr. Sargent: You're chicken!

Mr. Speaker: —that the question may have been somewhat unrelated to the original on which there were five supplementaries. The question asked by the hon.—

Mr. Good: By two people.

Mr. Speaker: —Leader of the Opposition related also to the Hydro task force. I believe it had some other aspect to it, too, but I deem that to be all part of the seven supplementaries on the Hydro task force.

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order, if I may, and I say it most respectfully to you. Do you know the Premier of the Province of Ontario replied to a remark from the leader of the New Democratic Party as a reply to a supplementary question by yelling across the floor? And now my colleague from Waterloo North, or Waterloo South, or somewhere in Waterloo is not even entitled to ask a question.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the hon. member for Sarnia, what's the point of order?

Mr. Bullbrook: The point of order is there is a degree of inequity that's prevailing in this House right now, and I say that most respectfully to you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why does the Prime Minister of Ontario have the right to pick and choose his answers to supplementary questions—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was a question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: —or an interjection from the leader of the New Democratic Party?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Surely to goodness, he has the right to ask a question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia is quite out of order.

Mr. Good: May I proceed, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact the hon. member comes from Waterloo county he may proceed.

Mr. Sargent: We'll get you—

Mr. Good: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We must stick together.

Mr. MacDonald: Now we know there is inequity.

Mr. Sargent: A bit of conflict there.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: What equity?

An hon. member: You are a very—

Mr. Good: It is an entirely unrelated question, Mr. Speaker.

Since the interim report of Task Force Hydro indicates that there must be a complete reorganization of the administrative function, that the office of chairman be terminated and Hydro be placed under a senior cabinet minister, and since I have an admission from no less than the vice-chairman of Hydro that 12 copies of the interim report are now in possession of Hydro and cannot be left out of the vault, would the Premier—

Mr. Ewen: Question!

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): Question!

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, that is not true.

Mr. Good: —inform the House that he will guarantee the interim report will not be changed before it is made public? How can he, in the light of his disdain for this legislative body, permit this report to be dealt with by Hydro before it is made public?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, without commenting on one or two of the rather questionable observations by the hon. member for Waterloo North—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, very questionable. Without commenting on those one or two observations, I would only answer that since there is not from the government's standpoint an interim report from Task Force Hydro, the rest of the question of course is completely irrelevant.

Mr. Good: A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If the questions is irrelevant, how can there be a supplementary?

Mr. Good: The supplementary question is this, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: You've got to believe the Premier.

Mr. Good: Is the Premier aware that the Task Force Hydro pamphlets state that the report must be made to cabinet before it goes to Hydro? If Hydro now has possession of 12 copies, as admitted to me by the vice-chairman of Hydro, how can the Premier countenance the position when cabinet, according to him, hasn't even seen it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would only say to the hon. member for Waterloo North, he wasn't listening very carefully just a few moments ago—

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): It is hard to follow the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I would suggest to him that if he had listened to the answers that were given, this question would not have been necessary. I will just repeat what I said before: There is no interim report in its final form available to the government of this province—

Mr. Good: Well, they are going to have—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and as I said just a few seconds ago, it is not available to Hydro either because there isn't a final interim report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the vice-chairman of Hydro can speak for himself; but it just doesn't exist. The interim report in its draft form is being assessed by COGP. No question about it; they met about it a week or 10 days ago. It would not surprise me if there were some discussions with Hydro. It would not surprise me if there were some discussions with OMEA. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the intelligent, logical course to pursue. And I think that even that should sink through into the member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Hydro doctored the report.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now if the member for Waterloo North is saying, Mr. Speaker, that the task force should operate in complete isolation, that it should not have any degree of communication with those people who were directly affected—fine; that is his point of view; that is the position of his party.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We never suggested that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We happen to think they are doing it in the intelligent way; and this report will be available to us. The hon. member for Waterloo North can then make his observations. But at this precise moment, if it is any help to him at all, there isn't a final interim report from Task Force Hydro.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

HIRING OF PREGNANT SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister of Labour order an investigation into the report in the Hamilton Spectator of June 2, that the Wentworth County Separate School Board does not intend to rehire for the fall term on a full-time basis, teachers who are pregnant?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we would be very glad to look into this matter, and perhaps involve our Women's Bureau, and see whether or not the board is doing the right thing.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): There will be women involved.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: Will the minister, in asking the Women's Bureau to investigate this, also ask them to investigate the possibility that the Wentworth county board has found a way of getting around the maternity leave clause in the Equal Employment Opportunities Act.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member no doubt knows, the maternity leave consists of six weeks prenatal and six weeks post-natal. I am sure our officials of the bureau will be glad to look into this as well.

Mr. Shulman: Do the same rules apply to men as well as women?

Mr. Deans: If the hon. member gets pregnant, he'll get his leave.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

WCB BENEFIT PROCEDURES

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): My question is of the Minister of Labour. Can he tell us if there are changes contemplated in the Workmen's Compensation Board procedures so that eligible recipients of benefits will not experience excessively long delays, as has unfortunately been the case in a number of instances?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, we expect a report from the resources committee hearings, with its findings. I guess it would be premature for the minister to announce any changes at this particular time, so far as the Workmen's Compensation Board is concerned. If he's referring—and I think I want to thank him as he did mention it to me a few days ago—to some of the delays in the processing of some of the claims, by and large, the board has done an excellent job over the years and is still processing claims as quickly as possible. But it does happen in many cases that the board has to wait for reports from medical officers or from doctors which, in many instances, are causing delays.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

BREATHALYSER TESTS

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice. In regard to the recently published reports, relative to his disenchantment with the breathalyser, could he tell me what he can do constitutionally in connection with his disenchantment since it's in the Criminal Code of Canada?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): That was one of the points I was trying to make at the time, Mr. Speaker, and I'm glad the hon. member picked that one point up out of several that I was trying to make. The question that was originally posed to me was, was I satisfied in respect of automobile accidents, particularly, as a result of the influence of alcohol being a factor. Obviously, I said no. I also indicated that the breathalyser test, even though it has some defects, is the only worthwhile test that has been developed at the moment. I'm not satisfied with it. I'm surprised to hear that the hon. member may be. I think we always should be on the—

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order, where could the minister infer that in any way at all from my statement?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, well, then I'm glad to hear that the hon. member agrees with me—

Mr. Bullbrook: Answer the question, because I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —that the test is not necessarily the end-all and be-all. But the point is that it is the only worthwhile one

that we have at the moment. Until an alternative comes along, certainly it is better than anything else that we know at the moment.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, since we all in this Legislature, on this side of the House, are really constrained to say at times that we wonder what the minister is doing, what is he doing in connection with his disenchantment from a policy point of view?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Pardon?

Mr. Bullbrook: What does the minister do? What does he do about things like this? Could he assure the House that he has an ongoing study in connection with this matter?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No; I have no ongoing study about this matter, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. member quite rightly pointed out, this is a provision that's in the Criminal Code.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister neglected to tell his audience that.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The Criminal Code, over which they obviously have full control. Certainly, the views of this government have been known for several years to Ottawa and, in case they weren't, that was one of the reasons why I gave the press interview the other day.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

GASOLINE RETAILERS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: What is the government's response to the state of emergency that exists in the retail gasoline and automotive services industry, about which the government was notified some two months ago?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member would have to be more specific. There has been some representation made, as I recall, from the retail gasoline association. There had been discussions here. I believe they have met with some officials of the government. I will endeavour to obtain for the hon. member any specific information, but I think the representations came from the retail gasoline association. I believe they are still under discussion.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: As of May 30, they had not received any reply, which had been promised them by April 30. They are worried about the situation whereby—

Mr. Speaker: Question!

Mr. Burr: —30 per cent of their members may go into bankruptcy, as a result of the price policies of gasoline companies.

Mr. Speaker: Since that was purely a statement, no answer can be given to something that wasn't a question.

The hon. Minister for Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Deans: He asked if he was aware of it?

Mr. Speaker: There was no interrogation whatsoever in the supplementary.

The hon. Minister for Transportation and Communications.

HIGHWAY 17 PAVING

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this is an answer in reply to a question by the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren), relating to Highway 17 between Copper Cliff and Lively. The contract was awarded on Sept. 29 last year, to start May 23 this year. In fact, the contractor did start crushing the aggregate at that time. He's working 24 hours a day. They will be starting paving at the end of this month or in the first part of July. The contract was to end 90 days after the commencement, which is around the middle of October.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. Would the provincial secretary advise whether a special departmental task force has been created to determine the needs of the English-speaking communities in this province in the field of bilingual education, as suggested in recommendation 76 of the Symons report?

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the initiative in this particular instance will lie with the Minister of

Education (Mr. Wells), and I understand that he will be ready very soon, to announce the composition of the committees which will be following up that particular report. His estimates have been before the House, and I think this point was made during the course of those estimates.

Mr. Roy: Surely this is in the policy field?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The point I'm making to the hon. member is that the initiation in preparing the policy determinations falls exclusively within the Ministry of Education. The policy field will then consider those particular alternatives, once that is ready for us.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In the absence of the Minister of Education, I suggest to you that this is in the policy field, and in view of the fact that the report specifically said that this was an urgent question, especially in the national capital area, and the fact that this commission, as well, has suggested that the task force should report by the end of the year, does he think that's going to be possible if the task force has not been appointed yet?

Mr. Foulds: Why didn't the member bring it up during the estimates?

Mr. Roy: There's a question period for this.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, there are estimates too, and the estimates were here. I'm not disputing the fact that it's a policy matter. All I'm saying is that the policy field has this particular report on its agenda and is waiting for preparatory work to be done by the ministry involved, prior to its consideration by all members of the policy field. The member would have to ask the Minister of Education how soon that work will be done.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay has about 35 seconds.

BUDWORM CONTROL

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I'd like to ask the Minister of Natural Resources what he proposes to do about the threatened budworm infestation which is going to hit northeastern Ontario particularly hard, inasmuch as about 25 million acres are going to be affected? What does he propose to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this is something my department is very concerned about and we are looking into all aspects of control throughout the province. I think the members realize this is a very expensive programme. We have a large spraying programme designed for northwestern Ontario, in the Quetico Park area, but we are studying the northeastern region right at the moment.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister going to do anything about it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We'll see how large the programme is and the costs.

Mr. Foulds: Hit them with a flyswatter!

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to update and clarify the existing Act, in general terms, and as well contains additional provisions for disclosure. Stricter requirements are proposed concerning the reporting of transfers of major shareholdings and additional disclosure requirements for financial statements as outlined, particularly with respect to subsidiary companies.

Certain additional quantitative restrictions are included with regard to the holding of common shares, which will help ensure that trust and loan companies retain the identity for which they were incorporated.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 27th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF REVENUE

Mr. Chairman: The estimates of the Ministry of Revenue. Does the hon. minister have an opening statement?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Such enthusiasm!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Want some help? Great fellow!

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): If each individual member applauds like this, you'll never get started.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let it be noted that the only member on the Liberal side who didn't applaud was my dear friend and colleague, the hon. member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens). I will give him a minute or two.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Because your own side wouldn't applaud you.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Maybe next time?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That is called a moment of silence.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, a few opening remarks might be of value inasmuch as this is my first opportunity.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We are going to have a vote on that!

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Anything would help.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Very modest!

Mr. Reid: You have good cause to be.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They might be of value inasmuch as this is my first opportunity to present the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue, and particularly since this ministry is responsible for many government activities not previously vested in the former Department of Revenue.

The Government Reorganization Act, 1972, as of April 1, placed the following activities under the Ministry of Revenue: All activities formerly associated with the Department of Revenue except the library, the assessment division of the former Department of Municipal Affairs, and responsibility for the Provincial Land Tax Act and the Railway Fire Charge Act, both formerly administered by the Department of Lands and Forests.

In addition, the Ontario Housing Corp. and the Ontario Housing Advisory Committee, which are independent bodies that formerly reported to the Minister of Trade and Development, now report directly to the Minister of Revenue. I will give an outline of the work of the municipal assessment division and of the government's housing policies and objectives under the respective votes of the division and the Ontario Housing Corp.

The major programmes of the Ministry of Revenue are the administration of taxes, provincial assessment and the Province of Ontario Savings Office.

At this point I should like to make it clear that the Minister of Revenue does not answer in this Legislature for the tax policies of the government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He doesn't want a full discussion of tax reform.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This, of course, is the responsibility of my colleague, the hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). It is the responsibility of my ministry to operate the revenue-raising systems within the framework of those policies.

My predecessor, the present Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, is to be congratulated for his efficient and intelligent administration of the then Department of Revenue. His approach to the task, particularly in view of the growing complexity of government revenue sources, has led to considerable improvement in revenue-collecting procedures.

In the taxation area, we are continuing to review procedures to ensure that this administration will continue to be both efficient and equitable as we develop consistent and rational public policies in the revenue-raising field.

In this connection, as I mentioned in the statement before the orders of the day, a special advisory committee has been established to make a comprehensive review of the Succession Duty Act. Among the aspects the committee will study will be the impact of succession duties on foreign takeovers of Canadian business. The special advisory committee is made up of non-government personnel from the professional and business world and some staff members, which is an example of informed public participation in the process of government—in this case in the field of tax development.

In addition I intend to establish an advisory committee on taxation to assist in advising the minister on matters of administrative

policy, tax appeal procedures, auditing, and so on. My predecessors and the very capable staff in the ministry have kept the cost of tax administration at a low level. It is our intention to continue this programme of efficiency and also continue to simplify recording procedures for the taxpayer.

Thus far, in this session I have introduced 11 bills resulting from new taxation policy as outlined in the budget. I would like to remark on one of these because it exemplifies the approach my ministry intends to take in the necessary work of tax collection.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): If you last that long.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has said that for five years.

Mr. Sargent: I know, but you are getting closer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have lasted that long; you are weakening and I am getting stronger.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Hey, you are not getting enough support. There are only about six guys over there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My colleagues know that I don't need too much support. They have a great deal of confidence in me.

Mr. Roy: You don't, eh?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to remark, sir, on one of these bills because it exemplifies the approach my ministry intends to take on the necessary work of tax collections. I refer to the Gift Tax Act. As this House is aware this legislation follows the form of a model adopted by those provinces which will impose a gift tax. As the tax will be collected by the federal government, all the provincial Acts are required to be the same.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): All the wealth is moving to Alberta.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The model Act as originally drafted, stated under section 18; and I quote:

> Every donor who makes a gift in any year shall, without any demand therefor, file with the minister on or before April 30 in the next succeeding year a return in prescribed form.

That is the end of the quotation from the original Act.

Mr. Haggerty: Would you mind repeating that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it is worth repeating.

> Every donor who makes a gift in any year shall, without any demand therefor, file with the minister on or before April 30 in the next succeeding year a return in prescribed form.

This would have made it mandatory for any person who gives a gift of any sort to file a return, whether or not the gift is liable to tax. I was unhappy about this and upon the initiative of my ministry, agreement was reached with Ottawa to amend the Ontario legislation to exclude from mandatory filing any gift not liable to tax under this Act. It is an example of how this government cares about its citizens.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Ah, and there's nobody here to hear you but us.

Mr. Roy: Try to convince us.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am giving the message to those who need it the most.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The press gallery is hanging on this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's not unusual.

Mr. Chairman, under the original wording, persons who were exchanging small gifts at Christmas or birthdays or anniversaries, for example, technically would have been breaking the law unless they reported to the government any of their small personal tokens.

Therefore, I am sure the hon. members will appreciate that the amendment means that you can give or receive a gift, maybe on Father's Day, and not have it reported without breaking the law; provided of course it is not worth more than $2,000.

Now, this raises the point of another change we made in the model Act. Under the original the minister was given discretionary powers to assess a penalty of from 25 to 50 per cent of the amount of tax evaded. I felt that this gave the minister powers that were too wide. Once again, in consultation with Ottawa, we limited this type of penalty to a fixed 25 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the time to discuss a few of the aspects of the gift tax legislation to demonstrate that this government in the administration of tax collection has no desire to interfere—indeed, wishes to avoid interfering—unduly in the lives of private citizens. It believes the powers of

the ministry should be limited as much as possible without impeding its ability to carry out its tax collection function.

Mr. Chairman, I present the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue for the approval of the hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Chairman, the minister said this was the first time he's got up to present his estimates as Minister of Revenue. This is the first time I've had a chance to speak about the minister—

Mr. Haggerty: It is his last.

Mr. Givens: —across the floor since 1952 when we were both elected as junior aldermen to the city council. There are a few things about him here—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Those were the happy days.

Mr. Givens: I take a look at the opposite chairs—I said on a previous occasion how much I love speaking to empty chairs. If it wasn't for the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) who has come back well rested from a European safari—it almost looks deliberate, as if they are boycotting the minister or they are protesting or something.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Don't worry about that.

Mr. Givens: I know how lonesome you feel there, sitting all by yourself—

Mr. Roy: Where have all the members gone?

Mr. Givens: —but you will remember, through you, Mr. Chairman, that when we were at city council together you were rather easy. You weren't too tough and there were times when you proved to be a pushover. As a matter of fact, you remember you used to get credit for some of the smart things I used to do—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: No, that's a fact, Mr. Chairman! I remember when I did a man a tremendous favour. As he left my office with tears in his eyes and gratitude in his mind he said to me, "Thank you. Thank you, lawyer Grossman". That is not an apocryphal story.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Givens: The thing that really burned me up was that Mr. Grossman isn't even a lawyer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Even though he has got his QC.

Mr. Givens: Now I take a look, Mr. Chairman, at the minister whom I'm supposed to criticize on about an hour's notice because of the way the business is handled so efficiently in this House! We were told last night that we were going to deal with the Revenue estimates after weeks and weeks of delay on other estimates.

I take a look across—I just got some research material, thank you; you know what I can do with it now! I take a look across and I see the minister isn't backed up by anybody over there, but I take a look over to the minister's left and to my right. I see the high-priced help he's got marshalled behind him and I stand here shaking with trepidation because I'm worried about criticizing the minister on anything when he's got this big army of civil servants over there. Al's army is siting over to the right to help him and we—

Mr. Sargent: He needs all the help he can get, that guy.

Mr. Givens: —as a small, stunted, diminished minority in opposition really can't muster the resources on two hours' notice to do the job that he and all his minions have been able to prepare for him for over a period of weeks and probably months.

As far as the Revenue estimates are concerned, Mr. Chairman, there isn't much that I want to say about that because as far as I'm concerned the minister, under the rubric of Revenue estimates, is really a bookkeeper. It's money that comes in from gasoline tax and from this tax and from that tax.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Givens: Not being bookkeeper-minded I don't know that I can even ask any questions on these particular estimates. I would rather address myself to the problems having to do with housing or the housing part of the estimates. As the minister has said on many occasions and has said today, the policies with respect to the revenue part of his estimates are really set by other ministers over which he has no control. He is really in charge of the cash register and he rings in the money as it comes in.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Givens: I have heard the minister stand up in this Legislature, time and time again, and berate members of the opposition, both the official and the unofficial opposition, about the Province of Ontario having the best housing programme in the world. Maybe it is. I suppose, compared to Bangladesh, Pakistan, Tahiti and Haiti it probably ranks as the best.

Mr. Minister, it ought to be the best housing scheme in the world because this is the wealthiest province in Canada. It's probably—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): In this world!

Mr. Givens: —one of the wealthiest areas in the world, not thanks to you but in spite of you! God has endowed this province with great natural resources and with great conditions for prosperity which is not necessarily—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: —thanks to you any more than it's thanks to the Liberal government in Ottawa. You shouldn't claim credit for that!

The fact of the matter is that after everything you have said and after all the statistics you've given us, when you walk across this city and other cities in this province and you try to translate these estimates you have given us or when you try to translate these statistics into reality, you find an awful lot of lousy housing in this province. You find an awful lot of problem families. You find an awful lot of people who aren't being housed properly. You always say, Mr. Minister, when we get up here and the editorials of the newspapers talk about over 20,000 people waiting for housing in this province, "Well, they are only trying to improve themselves."

Sure they are trying to improve themselves. People who live in shacks and hovels have to improve themselves; you don't begrudge them that.

How many people are there on that list of over 20,000 people that your department hasn't even investigated? You don't even know what their problems are; and you simply make the blanket defence that these people are "merely trying to improve themselves."

Here we are in the wealthiest city in the country, in the wealthiest province in the country, and over 20,000 families are looking for housing. You are trying to process them; and you are not doing a very good job at it.

Mr. Haggerty: Shame on you.

Mr. Givens: Now it is inconceivable to me that these people who are on this list are "merely trying to improve themselves" as a matter of convenience. There are many, many of these cases that you haven't even examined; and this is a blot on the escutcheon of this Province of Ontario and on your ministry.

You know, every so often you pick up the newspapers, particularly the real estate sections of the newspapers, and the real estate board says that the sale of houses has increased tremendously; increased 10 per cent, 20 per cent, 25 per cent, 50 per cent; and this is a snare and a delusion and a falsehood. Houses are not being sold today; they are being exchanged; and if you happen to own a home you can generally buy another home.

But for the young people of this province who are getting married and who are struggling with their first job, they are finding it impossible to find the nest egg; to find the down payment for these houses. They are not the ones who are buying the houses, but they are the ones who need the housing and they are the ones who are going to be the poor people of this province, if we don't help them; and you are not helping them.

Mr. Sargent: And that's for sure.

Mr. Givens: There is the matter of subsidization of home ownership. Why aren't we doing more about long-term opportunities to pay for houses? Why aren't we doing more about interest rates than we have been able to do?

I know the interest on money under our constitution comes under federal jurisdiction; but there are companies under the jurisdiction of this province which are making tremendous profits. Every day when you pick up the financial pages you find that this or that company's stock is going up, and their revenues are going up, and their assets are going up—and the price of first mortgage money is still 10 per cent. Now we all know that it is six per cent. A debt doubles in 12 years; at 10 per cent a debt doubles in about seven or eight years.

And you expect young people, or people in jobs which pay them only about $100 a week or so, or even less, to be able to afford to pay for their own homes under these circumstances, with these interest rates?

I say that it is high time that we lean on some of these people. That we suggest to them that they should channel more of their money and divert more of their money, since they are in such a profit-making situation, into mortgages for housing at a proper rate.

You should do something about seeing that the interest rate is controlled. They are doing it in various jurisdictions in the United States; and you haven't even looked into it. At least I haven't heard any report of this matter being looked into—

Mr. Bullbrook: And we have been asking the government to look into it for five years.

Mr. Givens: And as far as the young people of this province are concerned, when it comes to housing it is just like it was in the depression; I remember it very well, as you do, when they couldn't scrape together the necessary bucks in order to put the down payment on a house.

And the elderly are crunched between the upper and lower millstones for the same reasons. They have owned homes for 20 or 25 years and now they find that taxes are eating them up; and they can't maintain their homes and keep their homes.

Some of us are receiving our municipal tax bills now. They keep on talking about a tax increase of $95 a year; this on a $5,000 assessment. How many homes have you got today that are assessed at $5,000 in Metropolitan Toronto? Most of the homes of these people are over $5,000 in assessment, probably closer to $10,000 or $12,000, which means that their taxes have gone up over $200. They have no other source of income except the pension; and some can't get the pension because the pensions have been frozen at $80 with some of the supplements given by this level of government and the federal level of government.

But as far as housing is concerned, the people who really need it can't get it. The young people can't get homes and the very old can't keep them and maintain them, and I think this is a reflection on the housing policy of this government.

Large families, obviously, can't find living accommodation. I remember a few days ago when you were being questioned about this problem family, whose name we won't mention, you got so uptight about the name that was mentioned. Are we to supply family housing or housing of any kind only for nice people, for those who don't dirty up the walls and for those who live in peace with their neighbours? We have problem people; surely it's your responsibility and that of your department to see that these people are taken care of, too?

We have situations at OHC housing where there are no playground facilities for pre-school children. We have situations there where you have people who are being charged for daycare services, where the fees are geared to the money that they have. On the application for day nurseries, form 7, they take into account your income, your rent and your expenses, and so on. So, the lower your rent happens to be, the more you pay for the daycare service. Surely, this isn't right? What about the cases where you allow women to take children in to be cared for? You give them a break. You don't take into consideration in their income, the money that they get for taking care of these children, so they get a break there. But you're not licensing these people. You don't feel you have any obligation to ensure that the babies or the pre-school children are receiving adequate care.

How many housing developments are there where there isn't even the minimal amount of facilities, of playground facilities, of swings and jungle gyms and so on? There are no facilities for these kids at all, and we haven't done anything about it. There are not even chairs or seats or benches for the parents to sit there to supervise their children. I think we've got to do a lot more with respect to recreation and cultural activities and social facilities where we have these housing developments.

I remember, before I was in the Legislature, there was a report that was hailed with great fanfare, made by the then Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), in which he made certain promises about fixing things up for people. I draw your attention to the fact that that report was issued in July, 1970, and that the consultant on the report was Matthew Lawson, you will remember, Mr. Minister, who worked for the City of Toronto. He was the consultant to the Department of Municipal Affairs.

The one feature that was picked up by the media at that time was recommendation No. 6, that the province enact a moratorium on tax increases, due to the repair or improvement of buildings, to run for five years and the maximum amount to be $5,000 of assessment. Nothing has been heard of this recommendation since July, 1970. This was hailed as a forward-looking, progressive step. While

it has nothing directly to do with the increase of housing starts, what it has to do is to keep people out of the housing market and enable them to live in the homes that they do have; so that they can add on an extra room or two rooms or other facilities and not have their assessment increased, and hence their taxes increased with respect to their homes.

Nothing has been done about this programme, and it is imperative that something be done immediately, because of some pending federal legislation which takes into consideration the matter of the repair and rehabilitation of substandard dwellings, where moneys will be forthcoming from Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. for this purpose. It is being proposed now that federal grants and loans be offered for the rehabilitation of existing dwellings, provided that the federal grant shall not exceed $2,000 per unit, and that it's to be matched by an equivalent provincial-municipal contribution. It is contemplated that such grants be related to the income of occupants and to special provisions for the control of rent levels in the case of tenant-occupied properties. The grants would also be earned over a period of time.

In matters of this kind and in matters of enabling young people to purchase homes and in the matter of doing something about taxes with respect to the elderly who own homes, we have no objection if there is subsidization which, subsequently, when the houses are turned over and they're sold, can then be recouped, if possible. But, at the present time, this is the kind of assistance people need to keep them in homes and to keep us from having to expend greater sums of money on public housing.

What is the province doing with respect to such legislation? Why don't we act on it now, and implement this recommendation No. 6, which was announced in July, 1970, in that report, "The Maintenance of Property: A Programme for Ontario"?

With respect to land assembly, I don't think we should permit a repetition of the unfortunate Malvern situation. Everybody knows the difficulties that were involved there. They were really man-made; they shouldn't have happened. Land was assembled in 1953, and we know the situation we're in now: If we sell the land, we at least affect the market as far as the price of land is concerned.

There has to be more money for the acquisition of land banks and for the servicing of land. We have to broaden this to enable land assembly programmes to become an instrument of new community development.

Land use has to be inextricably interwoven with transportation policy. There is no use patting yourselves on the back because of the great thing you did when you abandoned the Spadina Expressway. You still haven't come up with any alternatives. You have already lost one construction season last year. You are losing one construction season this year. And you are going to lose another construction season next year, because even when they determine the site down at city hall it will take a year to prepare the specifications and the designs and drawings for the purpose of going to tender. These things have to be brought together. The left hand has to know what the right hand is doing.

An hon. member: Who cares?

Mr. Givens: Your department should be liaising just about every day with the Transportation department and the community planning branch. I suppose there already is some of this, but you haven't convinced me that the liaison that is going on is really giving all those benefits.

The same thing applies to research and development. We're still laying bricks and sewer pipes as they did 500 years ago, for instance. What are we doing with respect to research and development in this province to promote new approaches to housing to fit Ontario patterns—not the lifestyles in Newfoundland, British Columbia or someplace else—and for the purpose of developing and building housing? And what about our relationship to all the municipal bylaws that we've heard so much about? What are we doing in that field? I'm convinced that it's precious little. We've got to use funds for that purpose, and we've got to do a great deal more than we have done in the past, because if the motor car industry conducted itself in the same way that we conduct ourselves in the building industry, we would still be driving around in Model T Fords.

There is another idea that I would like to throw out to the minister. We keep on talking about building housing in the big centres like Toronto, Ottawa, Windsor, Sarnia and so on. But what are we doing about an imaginative programme to construct housing in the more rural areas or in the less populated areas?

We keep on talking about the exodus of people from the small centres or from the

country to the big city. I myself as mayor of the city of Toronto, have often bragged how our city had grown—every year for the past 25 years 60,000 people had come into Metropolitan Toronto and we had to water them, sewer them, educate them, service them, build housing for them and everything else. How proud I used to feel at that time!

We're strangling ourselves in this kind of operation, and we are doing nothing about trying to decentralize our housing. What are we doing in the central rural areas of Ontario to build 100 houses here and 150 houses there and to have that followed by industry to decentralize? We cannot continue to be importing people all the time, but we cannot build a Chinese wall around Metro Toronto or the whole so-called "golden horseshoe" area. Every time we bring people in here they have to be looked after from a sociological standpoint, and it costs us 10 times more in taxes than it would cost to build houses and to locate people in other parts of the Province of Ontario.

I think we have to have decentralization. And we have to work this out within commuting distance of Toronto, because it seems to me there are an awful lot of people coming into Toronto by car from the smaller towns to do business and to conduct their affairs. I see no reason why there cannot be a greater programme of decentralization of housing than we have right now.

Then there is the whole bugaboo of this permanent mobile housing situation. I know the taboos that exist with respect to those so-called mobile housing units. These are taboos and indifferences that developed 50 years ago or more, but things have since changed in the technology having to do with mobile homes.

I don't know why we can't consider investigating and experimenting with respect to these kinds of developments in various parts of the province; they would probably be less costly than what we have right now. I think it should be a function of your department to look into that situation and to plan and to service areas which can be used for this kind of housing.

I repeat again, before I sit down, my deep concern with respect to the people at the lower end of the economic level who still find it impossible to buy homes. I want to repeat the arguments that I made with respect to our youth and our elderly people who still find it impossible to get into that average range. We say today that an average home has to cost $30,000-$32,000. This is beyond the reach of our young people. This is beyond the reach of our people who earn incomes of less than $8,000 a year.

Mr. Minister, I say with great respect to you there has been a job done in Ontario. I hope you will stop making references to the fact that we have the best housing situation in the world, because we ought to have and it should be a lot better than it is. I would like to see you expedite your investigations with respect to people who are on the housing list that we have. There is a great deal of hardship.

All of us who sit in this chamber as members of the provincial House get letters of anguish from people who cannot make ends meet, who haven't got a place to live. These are the things to do before we can pat ourselves on the back and brag that we have the best housing system in the world. There are many people who are living in grief and aggravation and in squalor, who need our help.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, again I congratulate this minister upon evading the fate that some other ministers met. He is a standout, or a holdout, or whatever you want to call it—

An hon. member: A throwback!

Mr. Young: Well, throwback if you want to use that word; that is your word. At least he survived the Committee on Government Productivity in the interim report No. 3 in which the recommendation was made that a department be set up, as I remember it, the revenue and government services department.

It may be that when the plums were handed out this minister was there and there wasn't that senior ministry for him. He had to fit in somewhere and, in the first place perhaps, revenue was separated so that he could have that little empire.

I suppose, secondly, the fact was that the tenants of Ontario Housing, Mr. Chairman, had become so attached to him, and had come to love this minister with such undying love—

Mr. Reid: Love?

Mr. Young: —that the Premier (Mr. Davis) decided that he should also have this responsibility. This composite empire was built up—revenue, Ontario Housing and a few

other little dribs and drabs were thrown in—so that the minister would not be shunted entirely into the sidelines.

However, for whatever reason, the recommendation was rejected; for whatever reason we have the minister here. He is here and we have to deal with him and perhaps that is not so bad.

Perhaps, too, in the whole situation there was a bit of concern in respect to the power that was being given to both the member for Halton East (Mr. Snow) in connection with his department and the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) who has, perhaps, been given more than any other minister to do. Revenue, perhaps, was separated from him not as a policy matter, because the policy is still in the hands of that minister, but simply making this matter and this department a collection agency.

The functions are now delineated. They are here and I suppose they will be here for three years, and we deal with them on that basis. As the hon. member for York-Forest Hill has said this function is really a cash register function in a sense and the cash register rings when the taxpayers pay their dues to the government.

I suppose the first thing we should do is ask whether this minister and his department meet certain criteria. I would suggest that the following four should be among the criteria by which we should judge the performance of this department:

1. Is it efficient? 2. Is it fair? Does it treat people in like circumstances equally?

3. Is it courteous and responsive to the consumers, those people who, perhaps willingly or unwillingly, cough up their sustenance to this minister? And 4. Is it providing the information needed for policy formation in the revenue field? And I repeat that: Is it providing the information necessary for policy formation in the revenue field?

Taking these criteria one by one, on the question of efficiency I wonder if the minister could inform the House as to whether the department really has a unit which is studying methods of streamlining collection; comparing costs of collection for like taxes for other jurisdictions; examining the possibilities of more use of computers, and reviewing the question of whether Ontario should continue to collect its own corporation tax or let the federal government do it.

I notice that in the report the minister points out that there are a lot of companies which are a bit laggard in paying their taxes, and so he has to send out letters and various forms and finally send people after these. This means, of course, that you have two tax collectors bugging them, perhaps three, because there's another one at the municipal level. I wonder whether the minister has any real information as to whether the whole situation might be brought into greater efficiency if the federal government collected for both levels and then remitted the taxes to this Treasury.

The cost of collection for $100 of revenue has not varied much in the last three years. It dropped slightly in 1970, but went back up in 1971. It seems that as revenue rises there should be economies of scale which would result in a gradual reduction in the cost of collection if the department would shake some of the cobwebs out of its administration. We don't know what this department is doing to get rid of those cobwebs and to bring more efficiency into the whole department. Perhaps the minister can enlighten us in this when he replies.

On the question of equity, the lack of information is the great problem here. A great many rulings are made behind closed doors, and never published, so that other taxpayers don't know how people in like circumstances are being treated. There should be more right of appeal from departmental rulings. This is particularly needed in the sales tax field, where decisions about what is taxable and non-taxable are constantly being made and the taxpayer has little opportunity to argue about them.

I've sent several people to the department in special circumstances which seemed to merit a bit of mercy on the part of the department. In some cases, what I felt was mercy was shown; in other cases, what seemed to me to be a just case was turned down. Perhaps the tax advisory committee, which the minister is now proposing, might take a look at this and might work out some means by which the little fellow can have his right of appeal. There are those who are dissatisfied with the decision of the department, who do feel they should have this right to appeal, and perhaps this can be worked out. I recommend it to the minister, in any case.

Fairness should also include the question of a cost of compliance to the taxpayer. It may be fair to give no remuneration to income tax payers for making their returns if they all bear the same costs. But in the case of the retail sales tax the small retailer bears a disproportionate amount of the cost of collection, because the nature of his busi-

ness does not permit him to computerize the monthly returns and he has to spend several hours of his own time working for the government in preparing his return. We believe that remuneration should be reinstated for the small retailers for their sales tax work.

If the problem of defining a small retailer is too difficult, an alternative solution should be to pay a minimum, flat amount to all retailers, an amount which would cover the small man's costs. This, of course, would be a little difficult because of the variation in size. It would be of negligible importance, of course, to Eaton's and Simpsons but could mean a lot to the corner store, which I believe we still think has a role to play in our economy. The present policy of abolishing any remuneration for sales tax and other tax collections is this government's way of contributing to the squeezing out of the small businessman, and helping their friends from the United States, friends like Kresge's and Woolworth's and others we might think about.

On the third criterion, courtesy and responsiveness, there's little evidence of the government's so-called "concern" for people in its treatment of taxpayers. Many businessmen tell me they find it difficult to get information in advance on retail sales tax applications to specific items. Lawyers settling estates complain that the department takes an unconscionable time to release inheritances to those who may need them badly. Taxpayers sometimes suffer financial loss from the delays of the succession duty branch.

I have heard of one case where the estate consisted mainly of trust company guaranteed investment certificates. These ran out their term before the estate was settled but the officials would not permit them to be reinvested or even just rolled over so they could go on earning interest. And the trust companies would not accept them for rollover until they were delivered to the heir. In this case, the holdup was the obtaining of a certificate from the Provincial Auditor for some unrelated transaction connected with the estate, but not with the certificates.

The fourth criterion is of very great importance. The previous Minister of Revenue, the hon. member for London South (Mr. White) used to take the attitude that he was not responsible for tax policy and did not therefore have to answer criticisms of taxes he collected. I don't know whether or not the present minister is going to take that attitude, although he indicated that this is not his responsibility. I gather from what he said that he is taking the same general point of view.

We can see that he has a very important role to play in providing us with information on which to evaluate our tax policy. Who really pays the taxes in this province? How much does a millionaire pay on his estate? What businesses and products contribute the most to retail sales tax revenues and are they items which are largely bought by the upper or the lower income groups? What percentage of total corporation taxes are paid by our mining industry, for example? By Bell Telephone? By various types of manufacturing? By processing industries like Inco? We don't get this information.

The minister may reply that the annual report of the department gives these figures, but they are very inadequate. There are no statistics on succession duties paid as a percentage of the value of the estates so we don't know if we are collecting 10 per cent, 20 per cent or 50 per cent from dutiable estates. There are no figures showing the gross value of estates compared to dutiable value so that we can tell how much income escapes taxes for various reasons.

In the retail sales tax statistics, the report uses the rather broad industrial classification of Statistics Canada, which tells us little about who really pays the tax and whether or not it is regressive.

The corporation tax statistics are just as uninformative. All manufacturers are lumped together and I believe processing companies like Inco are lumped in here as well.

The mining sector is shown only in total; mining, quarrying, oil and gas wells. The mineral industry is so important to the Ontario economy it should be reported separately and these separate sectors should be listed. Lumping together transportation, storage, communication and public utilities is another example of hodgepodge statistics.

Since the Ontario government collects its own corporation tax, there is no excuse for this failure to provide us with adequate reports on the source of revenues. It is impossible for us, as an opposition, and for government tax policymakers to make a proper assessment of the kind of tax system we have until adequate statistics are provided. This government prides itself on its increased disclosure policies in other fields; here is one which is badly neglected.

On the question of disclosures, another very vital need is for monthly published statements of revenue and expenditures, loans and advances. The federal government pro-

vides this as a matter of routine. The minister may say he is only responsible for revenue and that the provincial Treasurer should have to publish the expenditures and advances.

That may be so but we have a cabinet committee to deal with this and there is no reason why monthly statements of revenue should not be published, instead of our having to wait until the fiscal year is closed. We would then be in a position to know if economic conditions were affecting the forecasts of revenue given in the budget; and if there should be pressures for revised policies in the light of revenue changes before it is too late and unemployment has overtaken us.

We would also be able to see if the budget estimates of revenue were tinged with rosy optimism, in order to make possible deficits appear smaller; or if the whole forecasting machinery of the ministry needs an overhaul. But maybe that's the reason why we aren't getting monthly statements of revenue. There are few corporations today that don't give at least quarterly statements to their shareholders. Why should the government not follow this desirable business practice? I would hope the minister would take this matter seriously.

The lack of statistics makes it difficult for us to assess the incidence of our tax system. The studies done by the Smith commission and Carter commission indicated that Ontario had a very regressive tax system, which bears much too heavily on the lower and middle income groups. There seems to be no evidence to indicate that these findings are still not correct. In fact, the unfairness of the tax system has undoubtedly been increased as a result of the recent budget that contained the biggest collection of regressive tax increases in the history of this province.

We worked out that the 1972 Ontario budget costs an Ontario family of four, with an income of $5,000, $121 a year. It costs a person with an income of $20,000 only $152 a year; almost the same amount. There's nothing progressive about that kind of a budget. If a family had a child in teachers' college, the increase would be $706 per year for the $5,000 family, and $737 for the $20,000 family—due to the hike in fees from zero to $585.

These figures were calculated before all the provincial park camping and canoeing fee increases had been announced; and these are things which affect the people on smaller incomes.

An hon. member: And licences!

Mr. Young: And licences, too. The trend of our tax system is also indicated by what has happened to the income and corporation tax as a percentage of total revenue. In 1962-1963, corporation taxes contributed 17 per cent of total revenue and personal income taxes contributed 14 per cent; more from the corporate sector than the personal. In 1972-1973, corporation taxes will produce only eight per cent of total revenues, while personal income taxes will contribute 26 percent. A glaring inequality that this government should not tolerate.

There are two other areas where I believe we need new policies in the performing of the revenue collection function. One is the whole field of resource taxation. With the mines profit taxes collected by the Ministry of Natural Resources we have set up a conflict of interest between the need to obtain a fair share of the return from our mineral resources for the people, and the pressures of the industry to increase its exploitation of our minerals. The many rulings and decisions which are made by the mine assessor and his officials remain an area of great secrecy. All we know is that the difference between gross income and taxable income is colossal.

Eric Kierans pointed out that for Canada as a whole, only about four per cent of the book profits of the metal mining companies was treated as taxable profits after the federal tax assessors had finished their work, and similar concessions at the provincial level probably produced similar results. And the tragedy is, of course, that so much of this income is shipped outside the country to foreign interests.

The first step should be to transfer collection of the mines profit tax to the Ministry of Revenue; that's another little job that we'd like to hand to this minister. The second step is to make the operations and decisions of the mines assessor much more open to public scrutiny. Only then will we able to find out what weight of taxation our resource industries are really bearing.

The second area of revenue collection where we need a new policy is in the field of liquor. The Ministry of Revenue simply seems to accept the collections of the gallonage tax, the licence fees, the mark-up profits and the Liquor Control and the Liquor Licensing Boards, without question. These boards operate in a field of secrecy almost as great as the Star Chamber court. It is high time that we transferred their revenue-collecting functions to a department that we can scrutinize more adequately and

that the incidence of their taxes and pricing policies were examined.

We hope, too, that the minister will look into this particular section so that he can increase his power, perhaps, in this particular field.

Mr. Chairman, when we come to the matter of Ontario Housing we in this group have some considerable amount of advice that we want to offer the minister. I'm not going to take too much time on that right now. I do want to say that what the member for York-Forest Hill has put on the record is all too true. We are facing a very great crisis in the whole field of public housing in the Province of Ontario.

I know the minister will tell us that he is very proud of the record over the past few years. That well may be. If the minister looks back over the period in which he has sat in this House he will recall that year after year this group has urged upon his predecessors that we get busy in this matter of public housing. Always the government has said to leave it to the private sector to provide the houses, until the time came when the crisis was upon us in such a way that government could no longer ignore the need.

So Ontario Housing was born and since that time it has, in effect, built a creditable number of houses under the circumstances. But it began a decade too late and the result is that the crisis is here and, even with the thousands of homes that are now being built or purchased, this department cannot possibly catch up with the need. We come back to that old fact that the need was there long before this government was willing to face up to facts. Of course, the other situation is that as inflation increases people on incomes which a few years ago seemed adequate are now finding that they cannot possibly survive and provide good housing on those incomes.

A few years ago a person with $6,000 or $7,000 per year could afford to buy a private home. He can't do it today and unless he has an income of $10,000 to $12,000 he is, in effect, ruled out of the housing market. As inflation increases we have more and more of our families brought into the realm where they desperately need public housing. The minister knows the pressure that's on, as every member of this House knows, from repeated telephone calls and repeated letters from people who are facing desperate situations.

When the breadwinner becomes unemployed, when there is serious illness in the house and the income drops to welfare or unemployment insurance, the rent no longer can be met in the private sector. People then turn to the public sector asking for a chance to get into Ontario Housing. People apply and they hope that within a month or two months or three months they will be accepted for an Ontario Housing unit. The minister knows and we all know that is a sheer impossibility under today's circumstances. That kind of unfortunate person is now facing a desperate situation which this minister is not capable, at this point, of solving.

I want to say this to the minister that I see a certain amount of progress in some fields in connection with housing. He attended in my riding, some time ago, the opening of a recreation centre in the Falstaff development. I think this is a real bit of progress in the concept of building public housing. We have a recreation centre and a place where working mothers can leave their children during the day. This is good, but it's new—and there are just too many developments where this is not yet the case.

In the last week or so I have had several conversations with mothers who are now desperately trying to get their children into swimming pools; but in the municipality in which my riding is situated, there are just not enough swimming pools to handle the need.

And again, perhaps as a matter of public service, the minister should think not only in terms of community centres with a gymnasium and other services. Pools where youngsters can learn swimming and play in the summertime are beconimg more and more essential. This kind of public service must, I think, be thought about in the future as we plan for Ontario Housing developments.

There are some of the older developments, too, that are rather seriously lacking in playground space; as has already been noted here this afternoon. I think some of them that look good on paper because there is a lot of playground space for kids in the centre of a quadrangle. But when the buildings were erected, you had picture windows all around looking out on that space. When the youngsters tried to kick a football, or when they tried to organize a baseball game, of course, there was panic among the authorities. That kind of play space has just not been adequate.

So we must think in terms of more land, more adequate facilities for recreation, and certainly a tremendous speed-up in the whole process of providing public housing in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I think with those remarks I will conclude my advice to the minister. It has all been good advice, Mr. Minister, and advice which I trust you are going to take very seriously today and in the days to come, since you are the minister, I suppose, who is going to be responsible for this segment of our business in the province over the next three years. We will have more to say as the individual estimates come forward. Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. members, having raised some questions of a general nature, are entitled to get some comment on them. I'm sure that is what they want. Although the hon. member for York-Forest Hill pointed out that I had got credit for a lot of the things that he did in the city council, I don't recall that. But I don't want any credit for the things he has done here today; let's put it that way; particularly the fact that he didn't even stay to hear my reply to his comments.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He just stepped out for a minute.

An hon. member: Gulliver had that trouble too.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Remember that when you say there are no ministers present.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You mean the things you have done were really instigated by the member for York-Forest Hill on city council?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's what he says.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member mentioned there are—and in juxtaposition with his statement—about 20,000 on the waiting list. I will have more to say about that when we get to the housing vote. And he used some of what the hon. member for Scarborough West has often referred to in this House as hyperbole, in respect to that 20,000 figure. He talked about so many living in shacks and hovels, and so on.

Mr. Lewis: No, I never used that figure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was referring to the term "hyperbole."

Mr. Lewis: Hyperbole—right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is exaggeration if it is someone else, but if you use exaggeration yourself it is hyperbole.

And in connection with the figure 20,000, he gave the impression that thousands were living in shacks, and thousands in hovels, which is a complete exaggeration, in my view. There are enough people we have to concern ourselves with with respect to better housing without exaggerating the situation. It doesn't need exaggeration. We have some problems to look after and we are attempting to look after them with, I think, a fair degree of success.

He referred to controlling interest rates, and the hon. member knows perfectly well that is not within our power. He did mention that it wasn't within our power, and then went on to say why we should do something about it.

I don't know whether the hon. member is suggesting that this is the sort of an argument that I learned from him in city council. I am sure it is not something I learned from him, because he will be told by his colleagues that in all the years I have been in this House, I never use that kind of an argument. It is always logical and straight and honest.

He did say something that leads me to believe that perhaps all that money that we are allowing for research for the Liberal Party, isn't being used properly. He said that we had paid no attention at all to a recommendation or report made in the city that something should be done about not increasing the assessment of someone who improves their property. I refer him to Bill 127, which at this time and for the time being at least does not permit a municipality to increase the assessment by virtue of improvements to any property up to a limit of $2,500.

So, now, the hon. member has learned something from me.

Mr. Givens: What happened to the $5,000?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. I said $2,500; that wasn't a bad start.

The member also said that we should go into a programme of building in smaller communities. I don't know where he has been. Perhaps I should have carried out an original intention that I had sometime ago. I thought I would get up before the orders of the day, which would mean practically every day that this House is in session, and announce the signing of a contract for building housing in any place in the province, be-

cause then it would become more apparent, in my view, how many communities are getting the benefit of the building programme of the Ontario Housing Corp. We are building literally hundreds of units of housing all across the province, not just in the big cities.

One of the things the hon. member has to learn from me is that the heart of downtown Toronto is not this province. That was one of the problems about which I used to take the hon. member aside when he was having trouble with our friend Mr. Trudeau up there. I said: "Phil, what you have to do is remember that you are not just representing your own constituents, your own ward, or your own area. You are the representative of a party that represents a huge province." At that time, I said a huge country.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is this a sermon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Wheat and fish and that sort of thing are important to other people in the country. I said you have to forget that you are representing just your own area. You are also a part of a party which has, as its concern, presumably, the whole of Canada, and in this case, the whole of the Province of Ontario.

So, the hon. member might learn that from me. I've tried to drill that lesson into him, that it's not just Toronto that needs and gets housing.

Mr. Lewis: Well, now they know it.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Certainly it clears it up for me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Housing is being built all over the province. Some day, perhaps, we'll take some time off and maybe in a matter of two or three weeks, because physically it will be impossible to visit more, maybe we'll be able to visit 5 per cent of the housing projects—not the housing, but the housing projects—which have been accomplished by Ontario Housing Corp. on behalf of the government.

I was very interested in listening to some of the things the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) said. He hasn't taken credit for some of the things that I have learned over the years, but he mentioned some of the things which concerned him.

He asked whether in the tax branch of Revenue we were concerned with efficiency, streamlining, and that sort of thing. Of course we are. Indeed, if the hon. member will read the annual report, he will find how little it costs by way of the collection of the taxes. He will find, I think, that it actually came down. I take no credit for that because I haven't been in the ministry long enough. It was started by a former colleague, the first Minister of Revenue.

Mr. Young: It should drop drastically now, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was carried on by my immediate predecessor and we intend to carry that on. He also referred to an appeal against tax rulings. We do, in fact, have such an appeal. We are prepared, incidentally, to give retail sales tax rulings before a transaction, if it's requested. In other words, somebody will come and request from the department a ruling on how this particular transaction will be considered.

As a matter of fact, the federal income tax people have only accepted this procedure within the past few years and they charge for that advice. If you ask for it, they will give you a ruling in most, if not all cases, but they will charge you for that ruling. We give out these rulings, in many cases, and do it without any charge. We give a lot of this information in the bulletin which goes out, I think, every three months, so that those people who have to look after these taxes, the small merchants, corporations and so forth, can get much of this information as a matter of course.

I have been handed a document which points out that about 360 appeals are filed per annum out of an approximately 30,000 assessments. And I am told that about a third of the assessments are completely cancelled out as a result of the appeals, a third are partially reduced and a third are resolved unchanged.

Mr. Young: Now what does "resolved unchanged" mean?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That it will go to a special committee set up within the department.

Mr. Young: Within the department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. Aside from the retail sales tax, I think I am correct in saying that you have an appeal to the courts as well. I don't think they do in retail sales tax, except in the matter of—

Mr. Young: So the department is reviewing its own rulings?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that you can go to court on any matter. Now there was some criticism—I think I can call it criticism—about the fact that I and successive Ministers of Revenue have stated that they are not responsible for tax policy and that might make it a little more difficult to discuss matters which are really related to tax policy when we are in the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue. I agree about that. I think that it does make it a little more difficult. But you know it is not just a gimmick so that you don't have to answer questions. If the hon. member will read the budget speech by the present Treasurer he will find right in the speech that the Treasurer has pointed out specifically that he is responsible; he is answering for tax policy. Now that doesn't mean—

Mr. Bullbrook: Would you permit a question?

Mr. Chairman: No, no, no.

Mr. Bullbrook: Just a short one?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What do you mean—no, no? The minister permits it.

Mr. Chairman: The minister is speaking. You will have a chance for a question later in the estimates.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, this is just indescribable. I asked the minister if he would yield for a question. He is sitting down. I can ask him a question if he'll yield, with the greatest respect.

Mr. Chairman: It isn't up to you to decide whether you ask a question or whether you don't ask a question. It's up to the chairman to decide.

Mr. Bullbrook: All right, forget about it.

Mr. Singer: No you can't, Mr. Chairman. You are a servant of the House.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): You should impeach the chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps the hon. member will take satisfaction from the fact that he will be able to get to it soon; I am not going to be more than a minute or two. I was about to add that that doesn't mean that as a member of this government I don't have to take responsibility for tax policy; of course, every member of the government does. The fact is, though, when dealing with all those matters within the confines of this chamber obviously so as to have some order, each minister has to deal with those matters which are assigned to him within his jurisdiction, and tax policy is not assigned to me.

Somebody used the term, in respect of my duties in the Ministry of Revenue insofar as taxation is concerned, that I was a bookkeeper. I think that is good. Really, that is how it is. I don't answer for tax policy. As a matter of fact some of the tax policy makes it a little difficult for Revenue to follow in respect of administration. But that's the way it is, and whether it should have been done any different I don't know at this stage. Sometimes I have my doubts.

The fact remains that as I recall that portion of the Smith committee which I read, the Smith committee recommended that Revenue be broken away from the Department of Treasury. I recall some of the reasons he gave, that had something to do with people who administer the taxes should not be those who are responsible for tax policy at the moment. I can't recall precisely the exact reasoning, you'd have to read the report.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You can't recall? He said there should be, but you can't think of any good reason?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can recall that he said that the department responsible for the administration of the taxes should not be, if I can recall correctly, the same department which is responsible for the setting of tax policy, and he went on—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we'll ask for a copy of that section of the Smith report and—

Mr. Singer: That is a very convincing argument.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not giving you the argument, I am just quoting what the committee on taxation said. Smith said, from the standpoint of objectivity and efficiency—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, that goes an awful long way!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Objectivity and efficiency were the terms employed by the Smith committee.

The hon. member for York-Forest Hill was talking about the fact that he didn't have sufficient statisitics, and perhaps I didn't follow him as closely as I might have, but certainly it seems to me the annual report of the Department of Revenue for 1971 gives fairly detailed statistics on where all of these

taxes come from in every branch of the taxation division. For instance, on the retail sales tax, it breaks it down by classification, by industry and so on.

I should also point out, in respect of his criticism about the cancellation of remuneration for collection of sales tax, that the select committee of this Legislature, the all-party committee, apparently agreed with this. I understand it was unanimous, that all parties in the select committee agreed that the remuneration for the collection of retail sales tax should be cancelled. If I'm wrong, I stand to be corrected. But that's the information I'm given.

Now to read from the Smith committee—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: "The reason there should be a Department of Revenue is to give Allan Grossman a job."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Department of Revenue was started some years ago—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It wasn't necessary to find the Department of Revenue just to add a department.

Mr. Lewis: In the event of a cabinet shuffle, we will find one or two convenient departments.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that's not the reason these brilliant people in the Ontario Committee on Taxation gave forth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now let me read that.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): A little louder!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It says: "Among the possible structural alternatives—"

Mr. Singer: Ah, that's definitive.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue:

> It is our considered opinion that a separate department, in which the main revenue responsibilities are brought together, offers the greatest advantages. Such a department would facilitate the consolidation of assessment, collection and appeal procedures for all major revenue statutes.
>
> While consolidation might admittedly be possible within the structure of an existing department, a Revenue department would emphasize by the very fact of its distinct departmental status, responsibility for the efficient and equitable administration of tax statutes.
>
> In addition, separating tax policy formulations from tax administration [which is what I said] would enhance, in the public eye, the importance that government attaches to revenue-raising policy and would enable Treasury department to concentrate its attention on broad questions of fiscal and economic policy.

And for the benefit of the hon. members of the Liberal caucus:

> We note that, to all appearances, experience with both the Federal Department of National Revenue and the Department of Revenue of the Province of Quebec has been highly favourable. In dealing first with the revenue statutes, now under the controller of revenue, we recommend that the government of Ontario establish a Department of Provincial Revenue, responsible for the administration of all revenue statutes now administered by the Treasury department under the controller of revenue.

And let me say unequivocally here—I don't know how I can say that unequivocally without saying it unequivocally—that I'm not too sure I would necessarily agree with that in case anyone thinks I'm worried about keeping the job. So let's not have any doubts about that at all. I have my doubts—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because with experience on this job, I am not too sure—in fact, I think I mentioned that the first time I got up in this House as the Minister of Revenue, in referring to some of the tax bills I was bringing forward. So, so much for that.

There are other questions that were raised in respect of the housing policy of OHC, which we'll go into in greater detail more appropriately under the OHC votes, but just let me merely mention the question of community centres, recreation centres and so on. These are now all part and parcel of the planning of any of the new projects. Indeed as the hon. member knows, I'm sure, all of the older ones are being reviewed and whenever it is possible these are now being incorporated into the older ones where this did not exist previously.

One of the reasons it was held up for a period of time was because we could not get the approval of the federal government to share in the cost of things like recreation centres. Just as soon as the federal government agreed to share in the cost we proceeded

on it. I think the first large one was at Regent Park where some $4 million is being expended, perhaps somewhat more than that. But again, Mr. Chairman, I think it would probably be more suitable for an orderly progression with these estimates that we deal with housing matters in the housing vote.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if you will let us just follow up the minister's comments on the necessity of his office for a moment. I should tell him that we remain unconvinced, and unrepentantly unconvinced. We do not believe it is necessary to have a separate department for this purpose. I was interested to feel at the close of the minister's comments on this subject that he is not convinced either.

Mr. Chairman, I would tell you that this has nothing whatsoever to do with the minister's abilities. I, for one, happen to regard him very highly indeed. His contributions to the House—not necessarily in support of governmental policy, but just in a general way—are among the most valuable. It's unfortunate that he seems to be marked by destiny for a sort of a problem career.

For a minister who is almost always in his place, he had to choose that certain Monday, when somebody from the Globe and Mail made remarks about who was here and who was not, to be away on some government business. As a matter of fact, he is here so frequently, and religiously, and carefully that I have accused him of being subject to the protestant work ethic. But he assures me that is not the case.

Mr. Lewis: Well, he is a fundamentalist.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't know. Mr. Chairman, when we are critical of the decision of the government to institute this department, it has nothing to do with this particular minister's abilities. It does seem really a waste of his talent to put him in an office, as ministerial head of a group of people undoubtedly competent in fairly routine proceedings and businesses.

As far as I am concerned there has never been an occasion—when I have phoned the members of the department for some special information—when there was any problem getting the situation ironed out. I just don't believe that it has to have the kind of political guidance—political in the best sense—of having a minister responsible, on each occasion, for the decisions taken.

Mr. Singer: And Darcy's $38,000 office?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes. Perhaps that should be brought to your attention, Mr. Chairman. I said that the minister's career had been marked by certain problems, but these things balance out in that, evidently, he has been provided with that edifice at the top of 801 Bay St. which, according to the news reports, even outclasses the office of the Premier and maybe even the deputy chairman. Did you have something you wanted to say?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I think that we could very well start on vote 801 and you could start—

On vote 801:

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right! On 801, pertaining to the minister, and the deputy minister, and the responsibilities that they bear. I certainly think that we ought to congratulate them both, because I understand those offices are what you call en suite, and that both of these gentlemen are provided with dressing rooms in case they have to attend formal functions, without returning to their domicile before going to the function.

I was interested to note that the financing of the decoration of the office for the previous minister—and I understand that the money was spent just a year ago—had to come from three separate votes, none of which was approved by this Legislature, for refurbishing the minister's office. Now that this minister has moved in, there is some indication that he didn't like the colour of the carpet, and that that had to be changed as well, even though $17,000 had been spent on the broadloom to suit the tastes of the previous minitser—Darcy McKeough?—

Mr. Singer: Yes, that's right. That's the fellow.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —who now is elsewhere in other offices.

Mr. Lewis: Remember I said it is a different kind of work ethic.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Mr. Singer: It requires a different colour carpet!

Mr. Lewis: A more experienced taste.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He likes to run barefoot in the broadloom!

Mr. Chairman, I suppose as long as there are Conservative politicians operating the government, there will be complaints in the press and from the opposition that they are

spending an unconscionable amount of money on the perquisites of their office. Perhaps the minister will give us some further information as to how he intends to rejuvenate and regenerate something that had to be improved from Mr. McKeough's tenure.

There is another matter under item 1 of vote 801 that I want to mention, Mr. Chairman; perhaps in some detail we can raise it on the second vote. It has to do with the ministerial statement today appointing a task force to examine the matter of succession duties. I am not concerned so much with the succession duties themselves—the succession duty regulation and the law itself—but with the role of the task force which was announced by the minister today.

While he read off the names to us there were some interjections that indicated, at least from this side, that we felt he was once again demonstrating government policy. He is going to reward old Tory retainers and pay off election debts. I have no doubt whatsoever that interspersed among the listed names he put to us there are one or two people who may have some claim to expertise in succession duties. I would certainly trust that that is so.

I was interested to hear the attempts of the hon. members to find a collective noun to describe this task force as it was assembled. Somebody suggested it was a gaggle of Tories; others thought it might be called a contribution of Tories; but the definitive one was, I think, that it was a mob of Tories.

Anyway, these people, ranging from—well, I am not sure what the range is—but Elmer Bell, of course, is a trusted retainer of the party; former president of the party; a QC certainly; and a man once again, like the minister, who has personal qualities and abilities but obviously got on this list because of his support for the party. It is questionable in my mind, Mr. Chairman, if this group of people is going to contribute to the knowledge that the minister is seeking, and perhaps this whole House is seeking, on the evolution and development of tax policy and law in this province.

It occurred to me that it might well have been a better position for the government to take to establish a select committee which, in turn, could employ certain experts to advise them as they held hearings and deliberated possible changes in the succession duty statute. I would have also felt that the minister or someone in the government might have expressed something somewhat more definitive as to the goal of this task force.

Surely one of the alternatives is not to attempt to add Ontario to the growing list of "Social Credit" tax-havens in Canada. I really preferred the statement made at one time by the Treasurer that the goal was certainly not to diminish in any way the funds that would accrue to the Treasury from estate taxes of whatever type. I think it should be made clear that one of the alternatives is not to move out of the estate or succession duty field entirely. Surely that is not a part of government policy?

Mr. Chairman, I hope I haven't been unduly unfair in being critical of the individuals. Perhaps this would be an occasion when the minister could, from the no doubt copious notes provided to him in this regard, tell us about the qualifications of the task force.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. leader for his kind comments about me. Ministers look for these little crumbs of praise; they don't get them too often.

Mr. Bullbrook: I thought it was very crumby myself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One reads the Globe and Mail in the morning and when someone says something nice, it makes your day.

I should point out, however, in case the hon. leader has lost sight of it—and perhaps other members as well—that while, as he wants to say, we administer the taxation part of the Ministry of Revenue merely in the capacity of a bookkeeper, I must tell him there are plenty of bookkeepers.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What was that? A bookmaker? Oh.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say bookmaker, I said bookkeeper. While I can assure him that has many problems of its own, I think he will agree that this minister will be somewhat busy. Municipal assessment, which is by no means going to be an easy bag, has been added to the duties of the ministry. The minister also is answerable for the Ontario Housing Corp., so I think the suggestion that this was a sinecure provided for me can hardly hold up.

Mr. Bullbrook: What is the rationale?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me get that statement about $16,000 and $17,000 for carpeting straightened out. That newspaper clipping was handed to me today, and as a matter of fact, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has it

a little wrong. The charge in the news item was that $16,000 in new carpeting had been placed in my office since I got there. I want to make it perfectly clear that is entirely wrong.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I knew that was impossible.

Hon. Mr Grossman: That is entirely wrong.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How many thousands has this cost?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I asked somebody for the information on this and I have been advised today that new carpeting went in on the whole floor. There was new carpeting in the reception room, and the old carpeting was used to replace some worn carpeting in some smaller offices on the same floor. This would seem to be a good time to do it, because other partitions were being moved, etc. So we'll lay that one to rest.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about the robing room?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pardon?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The robing room?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, there is a place to change one's clothes, and I don't apologize for that—

An hon. member: But do you object to that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If I had to do it myself, and there was space for it, I would still do it. It's a very necessary thing.

Mr. Reilly: I do it in my private office.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So should he

Hon Mr. Grossman: Now, let's get down to this committee on succession duties.

A statement was made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition—and there was a suggestion hurled across the floor of the House when I made the statement today—that it was a payoff for Tories for the work they have done for the party and so on.

In the first place, I think I can name only four out of this group whom I know as being Tories. I don't know what the others are.

Mr. Lewis: That is not a bad start.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member may be doing a great injustice. There may be some very, very capable Liberals on it and he shouldn't make those statements. And with great respect—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, undoubtedly there would be a few people there who would serve the minister and they might even be Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know. I will read you the qualifications of these people which I—

Mr. Lewis: How many New Democrats are on that committee?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know. There aren't too many New Democrats who are experts on succession duties—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and if there are, they are probably on here. If there are any who are experts they probably are on here.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Laxer would be available.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And let me say this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if this is a payoff to Tories for service to the party, then all the hon. member is really saying is that only Tories are prepared to accept as a payoff for that work volunteer service to the public. They are getting paid nothing for it.

Now, you know, I—

Mr. Lewis: No wonder there aren't any New Democrats on the committee!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member said it; I didn't have to say it.

I think these people are due a vote of thanks—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —rather than being criticized as accepting this work as payoffs. I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —when he goes out to dinner tonight and thinks it over, will say to himself, "Well, that was a wrong thing to say; I should have—"

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He probably—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Already he is agreeing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is probably going to say to himself, "Now, look, I should've asked first—"

Mr. Lewis: He will have bread and water.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: "—are they going to get paid for their work—"

An hon. member: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: "—and then if I had found out that they weren't being paid, I'd have let the thing pass." It might have been better.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have the background of all of these people. I would be prepared to read it to you. I can tell you this. There are only perhaps, as I say, three or four of them I know personally. Of the others, all I can tell you is that when their qualifications were placed before me, I can say they were of the very highest. They're very expert in this field; they have done this kind of work before; they are in demand when matters such as taxation, particularly succession duties, are being discussed, and we are very fortunate to have them accept this job.

If the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like it I will sit down and he can get up for a minute or two and withdraw his statement and add his word of thanks.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder why the minister would feel that he should appeal to the community for free, professional advice on this matter. It doesn't seem proper that he should, if he is going to go to the community of experts, rather than just people in the community who have a little spare time. If he is going to go to the community of experts for advice on the goals of succession duty policy, then surely he should retain some experts and pay them. Why—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member have any objection if we retain the same kind of experts who are prepared to do it as a public service? Shall we deliberately pay them, even if they don't want it?

Mr. Breithaupt: They will get bigger fees afterward. They're not giving you anything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They'll what?

Mr. Breithaupt: They'll get bigger fees.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well if that's the case they would get bigger fees whether we pay them or not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Are you going to read the list?

Mr. Good: Remember from a lawyer the advice is only worth what you pay for it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Langford, the chairman, is a partner in the firm of Miller, Thomson—there must be some Liberals and NDPers in this, listen to the names—Miller, Thomson, Hicks, Sedgwick, Lewis and Healy, barristers and solicitors

Mr. Lewis: Sounds like you are casting aspersions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The executive director is a member of our staff, Mr. Stephenson, who is director of the succession duties branch. He is acting as the executive director and will keep the flow of the work in order.

The other members are Elmer D. Bell, a partner of Messrs. Bell and Laughton in Exeter, Ont., a very great place from which to come.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who is that, is that Elmer Bell?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, and Mr. Bell has apparently carried on a very successful legal practice in this field, in this particular field for many years.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right, yes sir, he's certainly been successful.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I must tell the hon. members. I know of course Elmer Bell is a good Tory and I didn't hold that against him.

Mr. Singer: Oh, you are just all heart.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He ran your elections for years.

Mr. Reid: Have your own form of a LIP programme over there, don't you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. J. A. Brule, QC, I don't know him, he was for a number of years senior trust officer for the National Trust Co.

Mr. Singer: That is a good NDP firm.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And was therefore very knowledgeable of estate administration and related succession duty matters. He is a director of the surrogate court practice por-

tion of the bar admission course of Osgoode Hall, and one of the lecturers in that course. He also lectures in the continuing-education programme of the trusts and will section of the Law Society.

Mr. Wolfe Goodman is a well-known expert in the field of wealth taxation, as well as taxation in the broad spectrum. He was general counsel to the ad hoc committee on succession duties and gift taxes in the drafting of the model Provincial Succession Duty and Gift Tax Act.

Mr. Reilly: Aren't you sorry you asked?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has appeared many times as a lecturer and panelist for many national and international organizations, particularly the Canadian Tax Foundtion.

Mr. Stapells is a recognized expert in the field of taxation, and on Feb. 26, 1963, he was appointed by the Lieutenant Governor as one of the commissioners of the Ontario Committee on Taxation—

Mr. Singer: Well known and active Conservative.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —under the chairmanship of Lancelot J. Smith. It is not our fault that most of the brilliant people happen to be Tories.

Mr. Breithaupt: It all depends on who defines brilliant.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting that Mr. Stapells is not a capable man, and perhaps a brilliant man in his field?

Mr. Breithaupt: I think he would be capable of almost anything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. John M. Hodgson, QC, is in charge of the estate section for the law firm of Messrs. Blake, Cassels and Graydon. He is an expert in the field of taxation.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is what we want; good!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Frederick S. Mallett, CA, is a partner with Clarkson, Gordon and Co. chartered accountants. He is an acknowledged expert in the field of taxation and brings to the committee a great deal of expertise.

Mr. John Cheney, CA, is a member—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that one of the four?

Mr. Bullbrook: You've got one Liberal maybe, then.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Have we? Which one is that? Do you want us to pay him? Mr. Cheney is a member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Ontario. He is a member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of England and Wales, or was, in 1948. He is a partner with Cheney, Glenn and Graydon, chartered accountants in Oakville. Is it all right to have somebody from Oakville?

Mr. Reilly: Great place! Great place!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Garfield P. Smith is a recognized expert in the field of taxation, particularly income tax. Over the years, Mr. Smith has written a number of articles on taxation for publication. He is with the firm of Laventhol, Krekstein, Horwath and Horwath. Do you know them?

Henry R. Jackman is chairman of the Empire Life Insurance Co.

Mr. Good: They have only 2,000 people in the province paying succession duties, and if you keep on adding to that committee it will be as large.

Mr. Breithaupt: You will have them all.

Mr. Good: You will end up paying succession duty.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Reginald L. Kayler, QC, LLB, CLU, is the executive vice-president and general counsel of the Life Underwriters Association of Canada.

Mr. Lewis: What was that? What did you say after his name?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is known as an effective spokesman for the insurance industry.

Mr. Lewis: Would you repeat that, please?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Executive vice-president and general counsel of the Life Underwriters Association of Canada.

Mr. Lewis: He is?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. He has represented the Life Underwriters Association of Canada when they have presented briefs on other occasions, both at the federal and provincial levels.

Mr. Sheldon Taerk, CLU, is associated with Monarch Life and has carried on a successful practice as an estate planning con-

sultant, and should bring to this committee a great deal of knowledge in this area.

There are three governmental representatives on this, in addition to the one that I mentioned earlier. Mr. Terry Russell is the executive director of the taxation fiscal policy division in the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Mr. D. W. Rowsell is tax specialist with the succession duty branch of my ministry, and Mr. D. Lyall MacLachlan was the area co-ordinator and farm management specialist with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in 1967, and he is an expert in estate management. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) nominated him for this committee because he has dealt with many farm estates in order to assist them—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Also the family farms.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —in matters related to succession duty fields and, of course, we're studying the relationship and the effect of succession duties on the family farm.

Mr. Bullbrook: They say the room rents are going to cost a fortune when they meet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And it was felt he would be of valuable assistance.

Now, does the hon. Leader of the Opposition want to get up now with his statement?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, I am going to get up, Mr. Chairman, and ask the minister if he can tell us the terms of reference given to this—call it a task force, committee, what ever it is?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Advisory committee.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Advisory committee. They are quite broad, as I recall. Is it possible that they are going to look into the feasibility of moving out of this field entirely?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are going to, and I meant to make some reference to the hon. member's comments about that.

Surely he appreciates the fact that if the other provinces are going to get out of the succession duties field, that it will probably have some great impact upon Ontario and the possibility that people will seek tax havens in other provinces. So, it was deemed appropriate.

I think it is advisable that this committee do study what impact it would have. What are the implications? What can be done about it, if it does have some adverse implications, and so forth, particularly in view of the recent announcement by British Columbia that they were pulling out of the succession duty field.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: British Columbia. I think that there are only three provinces which have passed legislation that would put them in the succession duty field so that the federal government can collect the succession duties for them. In view of the fact that the federal government requires four, it may very well be that we may find ourselves alone in this field.

Certainly, this requires a great deal of study, and we would hope that this committee, and I'm sure they will be able to give us the benefit of a great deal of study and their expertise in the field—a very necessary one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I trust that will never occur all the same.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1 of vote 801. Carried?

Carried.

Item 2.

Mr. Lawlor: On item 1, just one question, if I may, on the legal fee situation.

Mr. Chairman: That is item 2.

Mr. Lawlor: Is that item 2?

Mr. Chairman: Item 1 carried. Item 2.

Mr. Lawlor: The legal fees have shifted. You budgeted for $119,000. Then they went down to $108,000 in actual expediture, and now you are back up to $116,000.

Mr. Singer: We are up to $145,000.

Mr. Lawlor: In my estimate it shows $116,000.

Mr. Singer: For 1972-1973, it is $145,000. He is asking for $145,000. You are looking at 1971-1972.

Mr. Lawlor: Ah, yes. Could the minister explain the shifts involved in the legal services? I would have thought they were considerably less, having cut out so many fields, the mining tax and the business of rebates to various people under the Security Transfer Tax Act and any number of Acts, so that the legal staff wouldn't be nearly as extensive. What is the reason for this change?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the reason for it is this is the first time for many years that they have been able to recruit a sufficient number of lawyers to fill the complement available in this branch.

Mr. Lawlor: How many more lawyers have been recruited?

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Did nobody ask the member for Lakeshore?

Mr. Lawlor: No. I am chagrined.

Mr. Turner: That is an oversight.

Mr. Lawlor: As a matter of fact, I think I might give this up for that.

Mr. Reilly: Is the member going to apply?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have been advised that the full complement is 12. For quite a long period of time we have been five short. Now we have a complement of 11.

Mr. Lawlor: How do you arrange the lawyers in your department? Is there a lawyer to each section, to the sales tax, the mining revenues and the various areas, or do they work together conjointly over the whole field? Let me put it again; in the succession duty field are there specific lawyers working on that area of tax revenue only? Are others just working—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am advised that they are not assigned to any particular area.

Mr. Lawlor: They handle the whole thing.

Mr. Sargent: These are the fellows who can't make a living themselves and go into the government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Item 2.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I hope that doesn't appear on the record. The hon. member should be careful. He is talking about the reputations of people, saying that they are there because they couldn't make a living. Well, that is untrue, the—

Mr. Sargent: By and large, I say what I think. That is my own opinion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have to stand up and defend those people because they can't defend themselves.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, sit down, I wasn't talking to you, I was talking to him. Why did you answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, you are talking in the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2. Any more comments on item 2?

Mr. Young: Item 2, Mr. Chairman. A question I raised earlier with the minister I don't think has been answered particularly. We have here corporation tax and other taxes, but these are not broken down. This was the question I asked as to how one is to know what corporations pay what. For example, what does Bell Telephone pay here; what does Inco pay; what do we get from the mining industry and this sort of thing? How do we break this down?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I just get this clear, which vote are we on?

Mr. Chairman: On item 2, legal services. We are on the first vote, item 2?

Mr. Young: Oh, I am sorry; vote 801, okay.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments on item 2? Carried? Carried.

Item 3, vote 801. No comments? Carried.

Item 4, financial services. Carried? Carried.

Item 5, administrative services. Carried? Carried.

Item 6, personnel services. Any comment? The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A couple of years ago we had a report from the first Minister of Revenue which set out the achievement of the department in improving its efficiency from one year to the next. I think it was the best annual report I've ever seen of any of the departments in that it evaluated the productivitiy of the department, and it is something that none of the other departments has so far decided to do.

Has the minister any figures on the improvement in productivity this year, such as those we were able to get from the first minister of this department, who seemed to take great pride not in the size of his department, not in saying how much more they were spending, but actually how much more they were getting for the taxpayer's dollar in the way it was being run?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Isn't that in the annual report? I am sure the hon. member will find it there.

Mr. Deacon: Do you have an annual report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member will find that on page 16 of the annual report. I presume what he is talking about is the cost of collection of taxes, because efficiency would—

Mr. Deacon: Where do you get that annual report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have all been distributed. They were distributed weeks ago. Last fall I am told.

Mr. Deacon: Last fall? For what year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For the year ending 1971.

Mr. Good: March 31.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I could read it to the hon. member. The total cost of collections for the fiscal years ended March, 1969-1971: In 1969, $1.65 per $1,000; $1.42 in 1970; and in 1971 $1.56. I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that there is an increase in the cost of wages and so on. I am advised that the figure for next year will be $1.58.

Mr. Deacon: One of the points that most industries try to achieve, and I think the minister when talking about it has indicated there has been an improvement in cost of services—I am sorry I don't have the report here; somehow or other I missed the report when it came in, because I was very interested in their first report. But there are new procedures in almost every industry which helps get more value for our dollar, and even though wages do go up there are other procedures in mechanization and other things like that which do improve productivity.

I wish to commend the department for this emphasis. I think the minister and those in the department can be complimented for providing this information. It is an example to the other departments of this government.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 carried? Item 7.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, under systems and programming the department is asking for $708,000. Is this for computerization, or what is the expenditure for?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the systems and programming branch performs special services and studies in data processing and general systems analysis and design. At the present time it is engaged in continuing projects involving the corporation tax and retail sales tax branches. In addition, the branch provides services and forms control and design and has a records management officer whose responsibilities involve implementation of a government of Ontario records management programme in the finance division of the Treasury. This is the branch that runs the computer programming system. And we are going more and more into programming in the hope that not only will add to the efficiency of the department but it will also take some of the load off the businessman who is required to fill out numerous forms for the purpose of the collection of tax. We hope that the advancing of the computer programme will reduce the number of forms they have to fill out.

Mr. Sargent: Through his lifelong service around here, does the minister know how many computers we have? Is this a lease deal or rental contract? What do you have for this equipment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, most of the work is done within the government system. We use the facilities of the highways branch and we pay for the service we use.

Mr. Sargent: Well, in your department's overall programme, how many times will this $700,000 item for computerization come up? Is this the only time it will appear?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will appear in a municipal assessment.

Mr. Sargent: Do you know, as a member of the Management Board, how much money we're spending each year on data processing and computerization?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I couldn't give the hon. member that off the top of my head.

Mr. Sargent: What is the contribution from your department then? How much do you pay in your department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, in this particular—

Mr. Sargent: No, you say you have other entries beside this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, this would include them.

Mr. Sargent: In all your department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is $708,000 for this particular tax programme, and the balance of it will be shown in the municipal assess-

ment programme. It will come under vote 803.

Mr. Sargent: You've been kicking around here a long time. Would you know, if we have 20 departments and you're paying up to $800,000 here, are we spending $16 million a year for computerization in government? How much are we spending? Don't you have any idea? You're contributing $700,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Until I have the accurate information—

Mr. Sargent: Come on, you never gave an accurate answer in your life.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm not going to give the hon. member an answer off the top of my head.

Mr. Sargent: Perhaps you have an idea.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I have an idea, but I'd rather not mention it.

Mr. Sargent: What do you mean you'd rather not? I'm asking you a question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because I'm answering now for the Ministry of Revenue; that's what we're dealing with, the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue. If the hon. member wants to talk about the overall government costs, I presume it would come under the estimates of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Sargent: All right. In so far as the operation of the computerization and data processing is concerned, in view of the fact that you're talking about the life histories of tens of thousands of businesses, what is the security factor regarding control? Who has access to these records? I'd be interested in hearing from the minister the area or amount of security we had in so far as the information in your department is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member asking what security we have so that people who are not entitled to the information don't get it?

Mr. Sargent: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The only security they have, I suppose, is that they're not entitled to it and wouldn't get it from any member of the department.

Mr. Sargent: You don't know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What do you mean, I don't know? I'm telling the hon. member they can't get this information from the department.

Mr. Sargent: All right, who has access to the records?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those who are qualified within the department to have it.

Mr. Sargent: How many is that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I've just been handed a note which says, "The Committee on Government Productivity found that revenue were the leaders on security in this respect."

Mr. Sargent: Twice nothing is still nothing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't even say leaders all over the world. I said leaders from the government.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is there something particular, some specific instance, that concerns the hon. member? If so, perhaps we could deal with it.

Mr. Sargent: The only observation I have, Mr. Chairman, if I may—I'll find my—it's amazing to me that in this area you don't know what is going on. You don't know whether you have security or not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Look how good that security is. I don't even know what is going on!

Mr. Sargent: Believe me, you are right.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 7 carried?

Vote 801 agreed to.

On vote 802:

Mr. Chairman: Administration of taxes programme, item 1. Is item 1 carried?

Carried.

Item 2.

The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: What I am asking the minister through you, Mr. Chairman, is what amplitude does he propose to give us with respect to what I suppose are basically policy questions in the field of corporation taxes? Is he taking the stance that he is only the tax collector and therefore has no powers over or desideratum touching the weight of the taxes or what the taxes are supposed to import or the effect of the taxes as brought in? Does he take that position for these

estimates or is he prepared to discuss a wider ambit of—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think that's the only correct position I can take.

Mr. Lawlor: I just to want to say I would ask him nevertheless, as the man most responsible for bringing in the moneys on these taxes to have very much in his mind at all times the priorities and the interrelationships, the balances and the proportions of the different forms of taxation. It's the tax mix that really counts so far as equity in the province is concerned—where the weight falls and on whom it falls, called the incidence of taxes in the province. That tax, as it presently exists is an inequity in this province. You, as the Minister of Revenue, should press for an alteration in the proportions. As you well know, the corporation tax continues to decline and is now becoming a tax of minimal significance, whereas it is a major and potential source of revenue in this province. You have some responsibility so far as we are concerned in that regard.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the question that is in my mind follows from what the hon. member for Lakeshore has said. We have little information as to what the source of the corporation tax and other taxes might be.

Where do we get the information on the taxes of Bell Telephone, Inco, Abitibi and various corporations in this province? Where do we get the information as to what they are paying into the Treasury? We have here information on what it cost to collect, but how can this minister refuse, or how can he not present to the House his sources of revenue? He takes in the money. Where does it come from? This is the question, I think, that the member for Lakeshore was asking. We as representatives in this House should have some information as to the balance and the mix of that kind of income. I asked the minister—

Mr. Sargent: You are not suggesting he make a special deal, are you?

Mr. Young: —where do we get this? I am suggesting that we just don't know how much income is coming from Inco; how much from Falconbridge; how much from Abitibi; how much from Bell. This is something we ought to know in order for us to assess whether or not our resource industries are paying their fair share into the public treasury.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would say again to the hon. member—does he have a financial statement in front of him?

Mr. Sargent: Nobody has.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, you should have. It was given to you months ago. Mr. Chairman, the complaint is either there isn't sufficient time given by a minister for the House to consider his estimates because they get it just before the estimates or three or four days ago; or you got it too long ago.

You have had a long time in which to study these things. I'm surprised at the hon. member for Yorkview; if he has the annual report before him, we give very detailed information. Take page 50, on corporation taxes. We not only go into the particular industry but we go into the class range, zero to $25,000 to $100,000—

Mr. Young: But we don't know what these individual companies are paying.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, surely the hon. member isn't asking that we should divulge publicly the tax paid by a particular company or person?

Mr. Sargent: Why not?

Mr. Young: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I wonder what the hon. member for Grey-Bruce would say if somebody wanted to know what his tax position is, and so on?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He could go to the municipal tax office.

Mr. Singer: Go where to get it?

Mr. MacDonald: Municipal offices.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We were just asked a moment ago what security there is—the same hon. member got up and wanted to know what security there was from the standpoint of people trying to get information on individuals. Now, he's suggesting there should be no security—anybody should have access to the individual's income or corporation tax.

I think that's against the whole principle of the secrecy that a company or an individual is entitled to, because he has, particularly a corporation, has competitors. Are we going to expose all of their operations to the public view?

Mr. Sargent: That's the very point I'm making. No one knows what's going on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You don't know. The hon. member may not be aware of what's going on.

Mr. Sargent: I know I don't even know the questions around here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Most of the members in this House do.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will excuse me. We read section 93—

Mr. Lawlor: You remind me of Pagliacci.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Who's he, Pat?

Mr. Lawlor: He wept while he smiled.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —of the Ontario Corporation Tax Act, and if he's not careful he may go back and find out he voted for this. Section 93, communication of information:

> No person employed in the service of Her Majesty shall communicate or allow to be communicated to any person not legally entitled thereto, any information obtained under this Act, or allow any such person to inspect, or have access to any written statement furnished under this Act.

Now, if the hon. member suggests that this section should be changed, of course he's at liberty to do so and get up and give a good argument why it should be changed. But that's the Act now and it seems to me to have a great deal of logic behind it.

If we're going to start debating what every company makes, or what they pay in taxes and so on, I think we'd be in a very bad situation from the standpoint of the business community. And I think that unless there's a particular situation where there is some suggestion of impropriety, or some company not paying the taxes they should be paying, and someone's prepared to make a charge, it should be left that way.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: There are a couple of speakers ahead of the hon. member.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that a shareholder in Bell Telephone or Inco will get this full information from the financial return of the company. It's wide open, it's public knowledge as far as the shareholders are concerned, and in every daily newspaper I open, I find the annual reports of these various corporations saying exactly what their profits are, what their taxes are and so on.

So I can't see the minister's point of view in this whole business of secrecy because it is public information in that sense.

Now, the thing that I am quarrelling with the minister about is that we have in this province very great resources—timber, minerals particularly. Now, those companies using our resources, the resources of the people of Ontario, pay us certain amounts for the raw materials they use—Inco for the ore underground; Abitibi for the timber that's growing there and which we own.

Now, surely, Mr. Chairman, there is eminent common sense in this House knowing how the government is administering those resources which we, the people of Ontario, own, whether we are getting from those corporations enough to pay us for the raw materials.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has that information. Let me just read, if I may, to the hon. member—

Mr. Young: All right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Page 50, industry and gross revenue classification. The total received from agriculture, fishing and forestry in tax is $2.19 million for the fiscal year ending in 1969. That shows you that particular industry, so the hon. member knows what we're getting from those resource industries.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, no we don't.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the total tax.

Mr. Young: The next one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The next one is mining, quarrying, oil and gas wells, $10,215,000. So the information is there, and not only that but as I mentioned—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —it is categorized by the amount of income, so he knows the size of the companies. For example, companies up to an income of $25,000 in that year, 1969, paid $105,000 in tax. Companies earning $5 million and over, paid $309 million in tax. In the second category—mining, quarrying, oil and gas wells—the same thing applies. They are all categorized. Companies who had an income of from $1 million to $5 mil-

lion, paid $692,000, and those with $5 million and over, paid $8,800,000. So the information is there. I don't know what the hon. member is driving at.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I give the minister a specific instance. We have great nickel resources underground in Sudbury and the whole basin up there. You have a corporation —United States corporation—which is showing a profit of an average, today, of about $200 million a year, after all taxes.

My question is a very simple one. How much is that company paying to the people of Ontario for the raw material, which we own, and which they use to make $200 million profit? It is a very simple question, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, the hon. member is going back to the previous question. In other words, he thinks we should give the information on the individual company. The hon. member also did say that it is public knowledge because they issue financial statements. If you have the annual report of those companies—

Mr. Young: It doesn't give us that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You want more detail than is in the annual report. Of course, I know that is what the hon. member is driving at, and we are getting back to the fundamental question of whether, beyond that, we should divulge the more detailed information that is in our files from these companies. I say to him that I think this would be a bad precedent because, there is no doubt about it, that would also spill over into the income tax field. Therefore no one will feel that the information they have given to the government is not going to be made public.

There is no use going into too much detail. The fact remains that I am sure it is a generally accepted principle in our country that, when a man signs a form relating to his income and the sources of his income—for instance, if he is getting $5,000 a year from a previous wife, or something of that nature —that all of this information on whatever source he gets his income is confidential, that no one else is going to know about it, and when he puts his signature to that, he knows, as far as is humanly possible, no one is entitled to that information.

The hon. member knows, too, that's a principle that has been established for many years, that it is upheld in federal jurisdiction as well. As a matter of fact, as I recall, there was some criticism in the House of Commons, some time in the past, because there was some possibility that someone there had access to some information which could have been considered within the four corners of that particular area of income tax—or corporation tax, I can't recall.

So what the hon. member is arguing for is a complete reversal of policy in this whole area. He says, in fact, that a person's income tax forms, a corporation's tax forms, its returns, shall become public property. That is what he is saying.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the minister has read a beautiful lecture on income tax. This is not what I am talking about. If I can get to the minister, this is not what I am talking about. What I am saying to the minister is we have resources in this province, which we own. All I am asking him—is this government getting enough from those resources in the way of income? Are those companies paying enough for natural resources so that my income tax, for example—my personal income tax—doesn't have to be raised next year?

Abitibi uses trees that we own. How much is Abitibi paying us for that raw material of their industry?

Mr. MacDonald: Resources tax, not corporation tax.

Mr. Young: Falconbridge is using resources that we own. How much are they paying us? That is all I am asking. I am not asking for their income, or anything about income taxes. I am simply asking how good a bargain are you as a government driving with these corporations as they pay for the raw materials of their industry? That's all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would say that that information by and large is in this now, unless there is some wall between understanding. It tells you here what we are getting in these particular areas—mines, quarrying, oil and gas wells. Unless the hon. member wants a further breakdown, and he wants to breakdown to what we are getting from mines, from quarrying, from oil and gas wells, separately, then we break them down and you know what you are getting from that industry.

Mr. Young: I am not asking if a company owns the oil, has mineral rights there—fine, that's their business, perhaps. But when they are buying it from us, if any industry is buying from the people of Ontario, I want to know what they are paying us for it.

That's all. Because with a company which is making $100 million, $200 million a year—some are making $150 million in the forest industry—they are using our raw materials to make that. My guess is that a company like Inco is not paying us even $10 million a year for the raw materials on which they declare a profit of $100 or $200 million across the border, and most of it is going over there.

We are being robbed of our natural resources and we have no way to find out how expensive that robbery is. That's my point. How much is that corporation paying us for the material that we own? That's all I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Under which tax?

Mr. MacDonald: No, resources revenue.

Mr. Young: Resources revenue.

Mr. MacDonald: Not income tax.

Mr. Young: How much comes in? How much comes in to our treasury to pay for those raw materials?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Under which tax is the hon. member talking about—is he referring to—under which tax? The corporation tax?

Mr. Young: I am asking about the amount of money these companies pay us for the raw materials we own.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Paying whom?

Mr. Young: Paying the provincial government. They pay in lieu of municipal taxation. They also pay a resouree tax for the resources they use—timber and minerals. They pay a stumpage rate and mineral royalties.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To whom do they pay the resource tax?

Mr. Young: The resource tax—stumpage rate in the case of the forest industry.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To whom do they pay the resource tax?

Mr. MacDonald: The provincial government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To which department, which ministry?

Mr. Young: You tell us. You are the government.

An hon. member: They are not paying to the—

Mr. Young: It comes to the provincial Treasurer, that's my point. How much?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am here to answer for those revenues which come through the Ministry of Revenue, and I have a big enough job looking after my own department—my own ministry—without stepping all across the map here. In other words, I take it that the hon. member is not then asking for us to divulge publicly the corporation tax returns to our ministry?

Mr. MacDonald: Hallelujah! The minister has finally got the point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are saying that. Is that what you are saying? You are not asking for this?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I was specifically asking for the other kind. If you want to divulge this one, why fine, I don't think there is any harm done. I think we have a right to know what these corporations, that are using our resources, pay into us in a dozen different ways, if they pay a dozen different ways. I have no objection to doing that. Specifically, I want to know what they are paying into the Treasury in return for the raw material that they use. That's all.

Mr. Chairman: With all due respect to the minister, he wouldn't have any opportunity to know what is paid into the Treasury. That will have to come out of the estimates of the Treasurer. We are only dealing with tax—corporation tax and other taxes.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, could we be enlightened; I wonder if we could be enlightened? What other revenue is available to the government of Ontario? I didn't realize there was any except through the Department of Revenue.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, sure there are.

Mr. Bullbrook: Revenues come into you? Does it come in other than through you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes, of course, for hospital insurance, mining taxes, things of that nature. As a matter of fact, if the hon. member looks at the budget he will find that, generally speaking, this is all broken down so he can find the information he wants. Under net general revenues, it gives all of the revenues. The Treasurer has reported this. He shows mines profits, acreage, gas—it gives

the figures. There is nothing secret here. It is all in here. Public utilities, timber charges, water power. It's all in there.

Mr. Chairman: This should come under the Minister of Revenue.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it should be discussed in the Treasury. Besides, the information is there.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Treasury. Okay.

Mr. Young: We still have no way of assessing the—

Mr. MacDonald: Overall figures.

Mr. Young: —overall income we are getting for natural resources.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, you are. If they give the hon. member Leeds riding, we'll find it there. It shows where every source of revenue is located.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre is next but he is not in his seat. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member for Yorkview is dead right. Now more than ever before, we have to know some way what the Americans are paying in corporation tax.

Going back to my days when I was in municipal politics, we made it a law that every taxpayer had a right to go down to city hall and see the assessment list. He could compare what taxes he was paying against his neighbour—and that was public information.

Mr. Ruston: Still is.

Mr. Sargent: And it still is, as my colleague says.

It is more important than ever now, Mr. Minister. I think there is as much chance as a snowball in hell of my going to your department and finding what some American concerns paid in corporation tax as against what some other concern paid.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are right.

Mr. Sargent: Because we will never know. You tell us it's in the book there—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Come on now, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: It's in the book. I don't know how dense the minister can be. The member put it very clearly—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We had to listen to the hon. member when he was so concerned about what security we had, just so other people can't get the information.

Mr. Sargent: That's the point I am trying to make. I am trying to find out what security—how can I find out in there?

You are not the smartest guy in the world, you know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Join the club.

Mr. Sargent: The fact is that you make a list there of the revenues from mining, from timber and from what-have-you, but there is no way of getting in to find out what kind of deals you are making with people.

And I don't believe your list one bit. I think you are just as tricky—I don't say you—I think your government is just as tricky as any government in Canada.

An hon. member: Oh more, more!

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Trickier than some.

Mr. Sargent: Trickier, my—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: All right, let's get back—

Mr. Deans: Tricky as Dick—

Mr. Sargent: Yes, tricky—

The chairman will say I talk about depletion allowances for oil, gas and minerals and that, and he'll say I am out of order. But in the area of tax fields, you have some area to make information trades with Ottawa to find out what kind of deals are on in these big corporations which are milking our resources. It burns me to hell to see American concerns come in here and acquire large rights to our resources and bleed us.

Mr. Lawlor: The mining assessors have all the rules in the world.

Mr. Sargent: We have no idea what the deals are. And what chance have we, after 27 years of you fellows in the saddle, to find out?

The minister says that no one will have the right to ferret out and see what kind of deals you have. Why don't you be a—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never said that at all.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, you say the lid is on tight. You said no one can find out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just ask the hon. member, when somebody calls and wants to take a look at all the returns of all those companies that he is involved in, whether it is okay with him for us to show him.

Mr. Sargent: You bet your boots. Everybody knows it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Okay. I am happy to hear that.

Mr. Sargent: Everybody knows it. My auditors know it. It is public knowledge.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: So I suggest the member for Yorkview hit the nail right on the head. You are milking us blind on these resources. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being taken from the country, not only in dollars, but in real products—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are talking like a socialist!

Mr. Sargent: We have no way of tying it down. One way that this minister could do is say, "Okay, here is the book—"

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's against the law. They can't do it.

Mr. Sargent: It's against whose law?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Your law.

Mr. Sargent: Well, let's change the law then.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Change the law: Get up an amendment—

Mr. Sargent: Oh, there is a fat one. That's it—like a private member's bill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suggest the hon. member bring in a private member's bill—

Mr. Sargent: You've got rocks in your head. Sit down, I'm talking.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I've got rocks in my head, because I am listening to the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Well, somewhere along the line I think that we must find out what the corporations are paying or what special deals you have with them.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2.

Mr. Deans: Well, what special deals do you have?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Go ahead.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mr. Chairman, if the minister won't tell us what is being paid by the companies, could be tell us the tax rate that is being paid by the mining companies? For example, I look at 1969; the total amount of corporation taxes paid by mining, quarrying, oil and gas wells were $10,215,000. Now, what is the effective tax rate that those companies are paying at the corporate level?

I appreciate the split between the province and the federal government on corporation tax. I believe at that point it was 40 per cent and 12. But it is really difficult to look at that figure for companies with profits of $5 million and over and see that those companies paid $8.8 million in taxes, when we can single out companies that have profits in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again the hon. member is asking us to divulge publicly the names of the companies and what tax they pay.

Mr. Singer: No, he wants the rate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The rate is 12 per cent. I mean, every corporation pays the same rate of tax.

Mr. Laughren: Is the minister suggesting that the controversy in the past couple of years over the rate of taxes being paid by the resource industry has no substance to it? That they in fact are paying a regular corporate tax as is paid in the secondary industry sector?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Young: What is taxable, that is the problem.

Mr. Laughren: A company like Inco with $200 million clear profit, and yet we are getting from that sector only this amount?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I have two questions, Mr. Minister. One of them has to do with a rather wider area.

On this business of tax rebates, which apply, for instance, under this vote, I suspect, through the security transfer tax, from which

the brokerage houses and others have been alleviated, you made provision, or at least there was some talk about making provision for bad debts within that particular ambit. What are the provisions that have been set up?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the hon. member say brokerage houses?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I am thinking of the security transfer tax, but in a much wider area, the whole business of rebates. Having cut out the rebate principle to that type of house under the sales tax provisions, you nevertheless made provision for bad debts.

Now this covers a wider area than just this vote, but it covers it too. I wanted to know how you provide for bad debts. What are the principles or criteria you use?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member referring specifically to the transfer tax?

Mr. Lawlor: Not specifically, no.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, there is no allowance for bad debts in the security transfer tax.

Mr. Lawlor: Is there an allowance for bad debts in the area of the retail sales tax?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, I guess we will come to it when we come to that. The second question I want to ask, is how does your department handle the possibility of double taxation as between different jurisdictions where sales of securities are made? If somebody is resident in Ontario but the sale goes through the Montreal Stock Exchange, who gets the tax between the two provinces?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member, I think, has got the wrong vote. It is not under corporations tax but—

Mr. Sargent: The minister doesn't know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, perhaps the hon. member can help us because it is a difficult question for any jurisdiction to resolve. It is very difficult. Essentially, what we try and establish is where—

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This vote reads, "corporation and other taxes," and I would have taken "other" to apply to relevant corporation taxes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have had trouble with this kind of programming in the estimates in the last three or four years. Actually it is not included under this vote. The hon. member has asked the question so I may as well answer it.

I think he knows that the problem is to establish where the sale originates. We, of course, attempt to establish that, and where we can establish that the sale was made in Ontario or originated in Ontario we collect the taxes.

Now if some other jurisdiction decides that the sale originated there and they are collecting the tax, of course, and they are able to do it, there would be double taxation. There is an arrangement between at least two or three provinces, between Ontario and Quebec for example, that there should not be double taxation.

Now I suppose the question will arise as to how you decide where to tax. Well I suppose this is a matter of staff—both jurisdictions getting together and between them making a decision and usually this can be established.

We have one case now.

I think the hon. members will appreciate I have only had a few weeks in the ministry so I don't know all of the things. I wouldn't know them all anyway, but a good portion of them I might know normally. The reason I am somewhat familiar with it, is that there is one current which is somewhat troublesome and I have studied it up because a decision has to be made in a case where they are claiming it would be double taxation. We are struggling with that now.

But essentially the answer to the question is where the sale originated.

Mr. Lawlor: Is there a reciprocal arrangement with British Columbia, the Vancouver Stock Exchange?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, just with Quebec.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2 agreed to? Carried. Item 3?

Mr. C. T. Rollins (Hastings): Mr. Chairman, gasoline tax. I believe in the manner that it is collected this item is most unfair to the small operators, retail dealer outlets, that are selling gasoline in this province.

In the first place, tax is charged on an invoice for a product that is delivered and not sold. Will the minister indicate if there is any possibility of making consideration to these outlets that are now paying tax on gasoline from a loss, from shrinkage or

evaporation and other items of hazard that go with a retail outlet?

The small dealer in this field has a greater loss per gallon than the larger dealer with a larger turnover. Have you the answer or any suggestion that you are going to make in the matter where you are collecting tax now on gasoline lost by evaporation and whatnot without any consideration to the individual outlet?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Hastings has me fazed, because I don't understand. I understand that we allowed 0.33 cents per gallon for shrinkage right across the board—

Mr. Good: Since when do the oil companies pay to the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to the dealers, the service stations. Does the hon. member have any information to the contrary?

Mr. Rollins: I am not aware of any company allowing to the dealer any shrinkage loss. Your sales tax is based on merchandise sold; on gasoline tax it is based on the invoice charge to the individual when he receives the delivery.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The allowance must be applied for. If the hon. member has any evidence that there is any case in which application has been made for a shrinkage allowance and hasn't been granted it, we would be very pleased to hear about it.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): This point is quite important. I have heard this raised by other retailers. How prevalent are the applications for rebates under these circumstances? Do many of them know their rights under this section of the Act?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that the number for the year 1971 was 3,383 claims, for a value of $204,881, and that is for shrinkage and spillage.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): To the companies or the retailers?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Retailer.

The bulletin that goes out every three months is designed to give all this kind of information and I am advised that this has been in a recent bulletin.

Mr. Gisborn: Could the minister explain how they qualify? What criteria do they use to decide the spillage—we are talking about spillage from their pumps, or from where? And what is the criterion for evaporation, and does the wholesaler also get rebates on application?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The original understanding was correct, they don't have to prove anything. All they have to prove is how much gas they sold. And they make an application and they are entitled to .033 cents per gallon, on the basis of how much they sold.

It is understood that there is much shrinkage and a certain amount of spillage, and the tax bulletin, in fact it is the last tax bulletin which went out April 1, 1972—service station allowances—and this goes to all the people, most of the service stations, those who are collecting sales tax. Service station allowances, it says:

> The allowances presently payable to service station operators for loss of profit on which tax has been paid will continue. The operator should apply as before on Form GT 1019 for the allowance of 33 cents per thousand gallons of gasoline purchases tax paid.

So they know.

Mr. Gisborn: Is it the minister's department's opinion that they all apply for it, or is it just permissive? Do they all apply for it, or just those who feel they have some loss—you know, it seems to me like a pretty firm and lucrative return. I am wondering, if some do not apply for it, why they would not, if it is an automatic criterion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that they are not all entitled to it because not all service stations are handling their own inventory, so that they wouldn't be making an application. Because the loss from shrinkage and spillage doesn't affect them.

Mr. Good: There is the point. I dealt with this other years and I understood that it is the supplier, or the oil companies that get the shrinkage allowance when they make application to the government. Now they receive from the service station operator the complete gasoline tax on delivery of the product, as mentioned by the member for Hastings, and no oil company will fill the tanks in the service station unless the gas is paid for at the time of delivery—which includes the gasoline tax, 9 cents now. So the oil companies have the money for that tax for the whole month until the 20th of the following month before they remit it to the Revenue department.

Now there are two points involved here, one of which I have made before. The oil companies have millions of dollars worth of gasoline tax money for an average of about, say half of the first month, plus the 20 days in the next month, which is about 35 days. And this is how the oil companies are financing new service stations and everything else of their whole operation at the expense of the little retail gasoline operator who has to pay that tax at the time it is delivered. Not when he sells it, as the member for Hastings says, but at the time the gas is delivered. I have brought this up before and it is always, "Well, we'll look into it," and nothing has ever happened.

Now, I would like a definite answer as to whether the retail gasoline station operator, who buys gas from the oil company, and pays the gasoline tax at the time of delivery, can then claim a shrinkage charge to the government. I don't think he can. I think it is just those who buy direct, and pay their sales tax direct.

Mr. Lewis: Why don't you ask Mr. Twaits if he will do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it is rather strange that we should be getting the charge now that the oil companies are getting X millions of dollars in advance.

Mr. Good: They do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The fact is that oil companies now are complaining that for years they have been paying us X millions of dollars in advance, which they do. They do, long before they collect. And I am advised, too, that the oil companies don't collect from everyone on delivery. There are various arrangements.

Mr. Good: Most of them—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And don't forget there are a lot of credit card sales—a very large amount of credit card sales.

Mr. Good: The dealer has to pay for the tax on the gas when he gets it. Nothing to do with credit cards.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No he doesn't; not in every instance.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): You are 'way off base.

Mr. Rollins: Mr. Chairman, further on that subject. Is it not correct that certain oil companies have, as underground storage, part of their overall bulk storage, that they are taking into consideration on the basis of their oil company manner of handling their procedure of tax? As the minister has pointed out, is this not correct, that major oil companies do have, in some instances, underground storage considered part of the bulk storage plant? And, as such, then there is an arrangement, or a consignment basis of the product which does include the tax—is this not correct; that it isn't paid for until the consignment is replaced—until the unfilled storage is replaced?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have got an answer, Mr. Chairman. But the problem—and the hon. member, I am sure knows it—is very complex, because there is no standard formula that can be applied in many instances. There are many different methods of handling gasoline at the level of the major oil companies, as to how they collect from the fellow at the pump—the different arrangements they have between the man at the pump and the companies. It would take a lengthy dissertation to explain the various different methods they have of collecting this tax.

I am advised, for example—if I am going to answer the hon. member's last question specifically—that we collect 40 per cent of the tax on the consignment to some dealers. Now, that is what caused me to qualify the statement in advance, because as soon as I have said it is "some dealers," then we have to go into "why some?," and "who are the others?," and all the ramifications of it.

I can tell the hon. members that, if there is any exercise which requires a tremendous amount of study and you wind up at the end of it not being too sure of how a tax system is operated, it is in the gasoline field, because of the very complicated method of handling the gasoline. There are so many complications to it.

If I had a document on it, it would take so long to explain it, at the end of which, the hon. members wouldn't understand. All I can tell the hon. members is that, by and large, at this particular moment, it is the big oil companies who are paying millions of dollars in advance of having collected the retail sales tax, the gasoline tax.

Mr. Rollins: Mr. Chairman, could I just sum this up? In view of the various methods of collection, and the fact that the independents, who, in my opinion, are not given the same consideration, would the minister give us assurance that he will review this matter, to make it all on an equal basis, and

to simplify some of the problems, and to put on an equal basis the independent operators who are buying and paying for their tax at the time of delivery on an equal basis? I quite realize that there are credit cards and Chargex cards that are taken in lieu of payment, but it all has to be handled, and in the actual operation it doesn't matter whether it's payment by credit card or Chargex card or cheque.

Would the minister give his consideration to looking into this for the independent dealers who are handling this so they'd all be put on an equal basis?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that if there's anything for which I would like to get a formula, so that it may be handled on a basis which is more intelligible and more even, it's the gasoline tax. It's a very difficult task to administer, and we've been talking about this at the staff level and certainly I'm going to assign myself to that, so that at this time, next year—if I'm still answering for gasoline tax—then I'll be in a position to be able to outline a more simplified form of gasoline tax.

And I see my staff looking at me very quizzically and saying, "Who does this guy thing he is, a Solomon?", because my predecessors have struggled with it, and it's a very difficult problem. I'll certainly do my best, because obviously, we want to be fair to everyone, insofar as you can have justice and fairness in taxation.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I have a somewhat simpler question in this area of rebate for shrinkage and spillage of the gasoline tax. When was that rate of 33 cents per thousand gallons instituted? And I ask that because as the gasoline tax increases, why does not the 33 cents per thousand gallons increase?

At some point when it was established it was a percentage of the tax paid. As the tax increases then that same percentage should hold and with this new tax increase should be above the 33 cents.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member raises a very good point. This was set 10 years ago. The feeling was because it was, at that time, slightly in excess of what it was felt was the actual loss, that it should be sufficient today. I am not too sure. It is 10 years old and it should be reviewed. I assure the hon. member we will do that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The motor vehicle fuel tax seems to have a much higher cost of collection than the gasoline tax. I suppose the motor vehicle fuel tax refers to diesel fuel and that sort of thing. Why would it have a much higher cost of collection? Wouldn't it be the same examination of forms that apply to the gasoline?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is because a lot of this tax is collected at the service station and in smaller quantities. The hon. member will appreciate that the sales tax, by and large, and gasoline tax, a vast, big, chunk of it is collected at the source, the big companies. They pay it on the basis of what they are shipping out, so you get it in big amounts. The diesel fuel, etc., is collected all across the province in small amounts. That is the reason for the additional costs.

Mr. Deacon: I am not, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And trucking companies and so on have to pay this.

Mr. Deacon: Each would be handled the same way since they are going to similar outlets. The diesel is going out to retail gasoline outlets along the way; you can buy your diesel fuel where you buy your gasoline.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It isn't that simple, because it goes out in one form and is used for many purposes, and in different forms. For example some of it may be going into a house. It is used for many things and there are many forms of the distillate itself and so it's a lot more complicated than that.

Mr. Deacon: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is only confirming what I said a little earlier, that there is no simple way of handling it.

Mr. Deacon: Who is getting the remuneration for this? Is it the oil companies or are the gasoline retailers themselves paid something for collecting the tax—the items shown under remuneration for the cost of collection?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The remuneration for the collection of these taxes has been cancelled.

Mr. Deacon: I thought it was just the sales tax that had been cancelled, but it is also these others.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): That was my question too.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to know from the minister under what conditions and to whom is an exemption given from the tax on gasoline.

I had correspondence with your predecessor on behalf of people living in remote Indian communities and, while it has never been stated by any government that I'm aware of, it was generally assumed by the public that those moneys that were collected by way of a gasoline tax were to compensate for the wear and tear on our highways and roads throughout the province.

On that basis, people living in communities where they didn't have any roads or highways felt that they should be exempt, and I did learn from your predecessor that this was in fact the case.

People who bought gasoline and used it in remote communities, not for vehicular transportation but for fuel and for power boats and things of this nature—for commercial fishing—were in fact exempted. At least they applied for a refund and the refund was given them. But when I looked into that aspect of it I found out that a good many of the reserves—as a matter of fact the Department of Indian Affairs in a good many offices—didn't even know that the native people could get this refund upon application.

When I looked into it I also found that there are a good many companies who are exempt, for whatever reason, from paying the retail sales tax on gasoline. I'm told that some of the large transportation companies who are engaged in interprovincial transportation don't pay directly to your department. There is some kind of another arrangement, a multi-provincial arrangement for collecting this tax.

Now is the minister in a position to explain that to me? Coupled with that I understand that some of these companies who are engaged in interprovincial transport don't pay a retail sales tax on auto parts and things of this nature. Would the minister clear those two things up for me?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that the retail sales tax there is an arrangement between the provinces so they each get their proportion. It depends on the mileage reported by those truckers so that each province gets its share of the retail sales tax on that basis.

Mr. Stokes: But who collects it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In most cases by the province where the company would have its head office. I am advised that there are other ways this is being done. It's not too clear at the moment. It's supposed to be collected in the jurisdiction where the company has its head office.

Mr. Stokes: The reason for my asking, Mr. Minister, is that you get a corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has a lot of vehicles for maintenance and things of this nature. They go into an auto parts dealer and they say, "I want $50 worth of parts"—and don't pay a penny on them there. Now, I am told that somebody else collects it—I don't know where, and what jurisdiction does it. But the thing is you get—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what is supposed to happen.

Mr. Stokes: You get a fellow standing in line, somebody that's got a $5,000 or $6,000 income, and he's next at the counter. He's charged the retail sales tax; and this large company isn't. Then he starts asking his member questions. "Why am I subject to the tax and this corporation isn't?"

I am asking, where do you collect it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, he'd have a sales tax licence and he'd have to pay the sales tax later, I guess.

I would say that the member should answer that he is supposed to pay the tax in the jurisdiction where the company is registered. And there are some exceptions to this.

The hon. member is suggesting that it's a rather sloppy arrangement—that some people are getting away with the tax. I wouldn't doubt it.

Another thing I found about the collection of some of these taxes is that in order to make sure that you are getting everything you should be getting, you would have to have such a vast army of inspectors and people that it would cost you a tremendous amount more than it would be worth to go after it.

So you have a system and it works at 99.9 per cent efficiency. There are always some areas in particular where there isn't a great deal involved—where it wouldn't pay to set up a tremendous supervisory staff to make sure you are going to get a few dollars.

Mr. Stokes: Well, all right then. As a suggestion why don't you charge them the tax

and then have them make an application for a refund, if that's the way that your Act reads?

Another case has just come to mind as a result of the recent budget in the Province of Ontario. In many remote communities in the north—and I hope the vice-chairman of Hydro is listening—we don't have any hydro at all. You have these small little entrepreneurs, sometimes they're storekeepers, who are generating their own power, and just recently you increased the sales tax on diesel fuel oil.

They charged them 26 cents a gallon for the fuel oil, 25 cents tax on each gallon of fuel oil, and then they make application for a rebate for 17 cents of it. So they are paying a new tax on every gallon of fuel oil amounting to eight cents that they didn't pay before.

I don't know how you can justify an increase in eight cents a gallon on fuel oil when you don't even bother to collect from these other people. You just hope, somewhere in your bureaucratic maze, that you are getting your fair share of the tax dollar. You have got a poor little entrepreneur who is trying to generate his own power way up in the bush someplace and you charge him 25 cents tax on 26 cents' worth of fuel oil and say, "If you want any money back you have to make application for it." Let's apply the law in the same way.

Mr. Ruston: Farmers have to do it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, we attempt to apply the law in the same way. If the hon. member is suggesting that we are not going after the big operators, of course he must be mistaken. It would be a lot easier for us to go after the big people if for no other reason than it is easier to collect the tax from them. You are getting larger amounts and you are able to get them a lot easier.

If the hon. member is complaining about the new policy to charge this tax where it is used for internal combustion engines, then I would suggest again he'll have to take this up during the estimates of the provincial Treasurer. This was a tax decision and we have to enforce it.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Advisory committee on succession duties, statement by Mr. Grossman 3237

Waterloo regional government, statement by Mr. McKeough 3238

New Toronto airport, statement by Mr. McKeough 3238

Arnprior power station, statement by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence 3239

Tobermory ferry service, statement by Mr. Carton 3240

U of T governing council, statement by Mr. Kerr 3240

New Toronto airport, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Cassidy 3240

Task Force Hydro, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Lewis 3242

Strike at Dunnville plant, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald 3244

Strike at Kitchener plant, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 3245

Quarrying operations on Niagara Escarpment, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 3245

Land purchase on Niagara Escarpment, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 3246

Highway 403 speed limit, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Ewen 3246

Metro public transit, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Givens 3247

Suspension of driver's licence, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Shulman 3247

Ontario Securities Commission disclosure policy, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. MacDonald 3247

Task Force Hydro, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Good 3248

Hiring of pregnant school teachers, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Deans 3250

WCB benefit procedures, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Rhodes 3250

Breathalyser tests, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Bullbrook 3250

Gasoline retailers, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Burr 3251

Highway 17 paving, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Laughren 3251

Bilingual education, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Roy 3251

Budworm control, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Stokes 3252

Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, first reading 3252

Estimates, Ministry of Revenue, Mr. Grossman 3252

Recess, 6 o'clock 3288

No. 83



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF REVENUE
(continued)

On vote 802:

Mr. Chairman: Any comments? Is item 2 carried? No.

We're on item 2; we didn't finish item 2.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): If you're going back to—

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute now, if we're still on item 2, there were speakers before recess.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): We passed item 2. I wasn't here but we passed it.

Mr. Deans: If you're still on item 2, I've got a couple of things I want to—

Mr. Chairman: I don't see any of the speakers present who wanted to speak so is item 2 carried?

Item 2 carried.

Mr. Deans: No!

Mr. Chairman: No, we're on item 2. Oh, I'm sorry, item 3.

Item 2 has been carried, we're on item 3.

Mr. Deans: I've nothing to say on item 3.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried.

Mr. Deans: I had something but I missed it.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4, succession duties.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): On item 4, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief remarks on which I think I would ask the minister to make a special note.

When he released the announcement of the formation of the task force on succession duties I noted that the matter which concerned me was dealt with rather vaguely in the last paragraph of his announcement, that this committee would look into the climate—I believe that was the word used—of Ontario as it related to succession duties.

I happen to believe that succession duties should be standard and equal all across our country. I feel that we should no more set up barriers from one province to another any more than we should have provincial trade barriers. When the committee looks into the matter of succession duties, I think they should look particularly at the effects that tax or the lack of it has from one province to another as it relates to Canada as a whole.

There are people who, I believe, are very anxious to remain residents of the province in which they now reside. They would like to see Canadian industry and Canadian development done with Canadian capital but because of the diversity of tax laws across our country and the announcement of British Columbia last week, it seems it is now more difficult than ever for people with large sums of Canadian investment capital to rationalize within their own minds what they should do.

I don't think this is right. I think Canadians are Canadians regardless of in which province they live. I believe the minister made the statement last fall or last December that—pardon me, I believe it was the Treasurer—until such time as the Province of Ontario is able to ascertain the revenue which will be developed from the federal capital gains tax—that is the kickback to the Province of Ontario—Ontario will remain in the succession duty field.

This is quite understandable but I am wondering if this province has ever thought of trying to reach a mutual agreement with other provinces on standardizing succession duties across the country. I feel that we are setting up a very artificial type of investment and involvement of people when we start making it more lucrative for a person to be a resident of one province than another. I think this is completely out of place in the whole concept of our Canadian economy.

I could inform the minister at this time of financiers with millions of dollars ready to invest in the province of Ontario. But they are hesitant, because of the fact that

they are looking very seriously at tax havens which are being set up in other provinces. I personally don't think this is right. I think we should have standardization across the provinces. We really have no room for provincial tax barriers, which is what this is now amounting to with Alberta, British Columbia, and, I believe, Prince Edward Island now looking at this very thing.

We find that the income from succession duties last year, I believe, was in about the $80 million class. There are very few estates affected by it, I think fewer than 2,000. The whole matter of succession duties is one that has to be looked at in the light of how it is going to affect the infusion of Canadian investment capital into Canadian development.

I would hate to think that those people who are creative, and have been creative in the province of Ontario, will be forced to relinquish their residency. They probably wouldn't go so far as to move out of Canada, as some others have done, which I regret very much, but would perhaps seriously consider moving to another province of Canada in order to retain their investment ambition and to retain their initiative in investing in Canada. Many people feel very strongly about this, being able to use their money to invest solely in Canada. I don't think these provincial barriers are doing one bit of good.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4, any more? Carried? Item 5? The hon. member for High Park?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Yes. I have one or two brief questions, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. I just want to know, to get my own mind clear, if, as a private citizen, I were to sell a car to my colleague from Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr), who is responsible for the sales tax being paid?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): The purchaser.

Mr. Shulman: The purchaser. Now, suppose I, as the seller, am dubious about my friend from Sandwich-Riverside and want to make sure he has paid it. How would I find out? How would I check?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I don't suppose it would be really the hon. member's concern. I think the duty devolves upon the purchaser. The hon. member doesn't have a vendor's licence, so he's not being held responsible for it. Presumably it's the purchaser. It's his responsibility. If he doesn't pay it, and if the hon. member doesn't think he has, all he has to do is report it to the department, and make it their business to find out whether he has paid it or not.

Mr. Shulman: As a public-spirited citizen, and if I am rather dubious about my friend from Sandwich-Riverside, and want to be sure he's paid it, who would I write to in your department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Retail sales branch.

Mr. Shulman: Of course, they would be able to look it up and let me know—is that the situation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Well, that's fine. Thank you very much.

Now I want to tell you what really happened, so the minister can know. Now that we have the theory, let's go into the practice. Last—

Mr. Deans: Say it loud enough so we can put it on the record.

Mr. Shulman: I just wanted to get your answers on the record before we went into the situation. Last Feb. 28, 1972, a lawyer by the name of Brian Dunn from the firm of Levenson, Sack and Dunn, wrote the retail sales tax department at Queen's Park as follows:

> Dear Sirs:
>
> Would you please advise us whether retail sales tax has been paid on the transaction herein described: vendor—Livingstone Transportation, 81 Gaylord Rd., St. Thomas, Ont.; purchaser—Ronald Haight, 165 Laurentian Dr., London, Ont.; date of sale—Sept. 30, 1971; vehicle sold—1961 GMC tractor, model HM8640A, serial number D066231; selling price—$11,700. This is a matter of some urgency and we would appreciate an early response.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> Brian A. Dunn.

That was dated Feb. 28, 1972.

On March 3, 1972, Mr. Dunn received a letter back from your department which read as follows:

> Messrs. Levenson, Sack and Dunn,
> Barristers and Solicitors,
> Suite 801, 85 Richmond St. W.,
> Toronto 1, Ont.
>
> Attention Mr. B. A. Dunn

Dear Sir.

In reply to your letter of Feb. 28, 1972, we would inform you that your letter concerning the sale of a 1961 GMC tractor has been forwarded to our district office at 1472 Dundas St. E., London, Ont., telephone number 451-3000, for their attention under section 4.

Please contact them for any further information.

Yours very truly,
G. D. Westlake,
Chief Collection Officer.

Four days after that another letter went out from the Department of Revenue, dated March 7, 1972, which reads as follows—to Levenson, Sack and Dunn again:

Dear Sirs:

Re Livingston Transportation Ltd., Vendor Permit #2327412

In reply to your letter of Feb. 28, 1972, we would advise that it is our understanding that sales tax was collected and remitted to the branch by the above noted vendor in connection with the sale of a 1969 GMC tractor, serial number DO66231, to a Ronald Haight of 165 Laurentian Dr., London, Ont., on Sept. 30, 1972, for $11,700.

We trust that this information answers your query satisfactorily.

Well Mr. Dunn, being a lawyer, wondered why it was worded sort of oddly—"it is our understanding"—so he wrote back again to the district director, Department of Revenue, retail sales tax branch:

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your letter of March 7, 1972. Unfortunately your answer is not a satisfactory one from our standpoint in that we cannot rely on the department's understanding the sales tax was collected and remitted. We would appreciate your advice as to who remitted the tax, the date on which it was remitted, and the amount.

Yours very truly,
Levenson, Sask and Dunn.

On March 17 he got another letter, this time from the district office director in the Department of Revenue retail sales tax branch—it gets worse as we go along, I'm sorry:

Dear Mr. Dunn:

In reply to your letter of March 13, we would advise that it is not possible for us to verify that sales tax was collected and remitted without performing an inspection or audit of the above noted vendor's records.

Unfortunately we are not in a position to undertake such a project at this time. It should be noted that when a vendor makes a taxable sale, the purchaser is usually supplied with an invoice which indicates the amount of tax payable. Such a document would constithute proof that the tax was paid by the purchaser and collected by the vendor. When a vendor fails to remit tax collected, he is assessed accordinigly on discovery by our audit staff.

We regret that we cannot be of further assistance to you in this matter.

Your very truly,
P. J. Bruie,
District Office Director.

Well Mr. Dunn thought it a little odd that you couldn't find out whether the tax had been paid or not, so now he phoned, in March, and said, "Now, this is ridiculous. Surely you are able to go out and find whether the tax is paid. The department can't be in so much chaos." And they said, "Don't worry, we will go out and we will do an audit, and we will find out whether the tax really was paid by this fellow."

A week went by and nothing happened, so he wrote again and this time to Mr. Cornish, Department of Revenue, retail sales tax branch, 1472 Dundas St. E., London, Ont.:

Dear Mr. Cornish:

You will recall that in the early part of March I spoke to you with respect to obtaining information as to whether or not a retail sales tax had been paid by either the vendor or purchaser of a 1969 GMC tractor.

At that time you explained to me that a definite answer could only be forthcoming if someone attended the premises of the vendor to check the vendor's records. You indicated to me at that time that no one was available but you expected to have someone available within a week or so.

Since our telephone conversation I have received correspondence from your department which I find to be somewhat alarming, both from the standpoint that I represent a client, and also that I happen to be a taxpayer. I find it incredible that your department cannot determine whether or not retail sales tax has been paid, and that you operate on the assumption that it has been paid.

I enclose copies of all correspondence with the department from my letter of Feb. 28 to the recent response of March 17. It should be apparent to you that the state of affairs as represented by the correspondence is completely unsatisfactory. I request you send someone to the premises of the vendor to obtain documentary proof of the fact of payment of retail sales tax on the tractor in question.

If you have any questions with respect to the above, please do not hesitate to telephone me.

Yours truly,
Brian Dunn.

And now comes the corker—hold your seats.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Keep your seatbelts on.

Mr. Shulman: We now have a letter dated April 10, 1972, and this one is a beauty. This is addressed to Mr. Dunn again—Levenson, Sack and Dunn re Livingstone Transportation Ltd., vendor of permit number 23274212. This comes after all the other correspondence that said first, they presumed it had been paid, then they had no way of checking whether it had been paid, and then they were going to send someone out to see whether it had been paid. Now comes this letter. Just listen to this one.

We regret to advise that unless you can supply this office with written authority and direction from the vendor, we have no alternative than to follow the provisions of section 14 of the Retail Sales Tax Act which forbids branch personnel from providing the information you have requested. If you wish to discuss this matter further, do not hesitate to call me at my office.

Yours very truly,
P. J. Bruie,
District Office Director.

So first they assumed it had been paid, then they were not able to find out whether or not, it had been paid, and finally they said they were not going to tell the inquirer whether it had been paid.

Will the minister explain what in hell is going on in his department?

Mr. Chairman. Order! Before you rise I have an important announcement to make. We have some guests in the gallery tonight, 12 young people from the Maritimes who are visiting Ontario for the first time and are from the School for the Blind in Halifax. They visited the Ontario Science Centre today and are returning home tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has asked me what the hell is going on. All I can tell him is I don't know what the hell is going on, but I will bloody well find out.

Mr. Shulman: Does the minister have someone here from the Retail Sales Tax department who can tell us what the policy is on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Garland, who is head of the branch says he hasn't heard of this case—although with all of that correspondence you would think the whole department would have heard of it. The minister hasn't heard of it and there is no use making comment on it. The policy of the department is to collect the tax which is rightfully due—which is pretty obvious.

To make any comment on this without having all the correspondence or having the whole file in front of me would be improper. There must be something about this thing that would make it such an esoteric file. I just don't understand it myself. To make any comment, as I say, would at this time be unwise. We will go into this, we will look at the file and I will advise the hon. member as to what the difficulties are in this case.

Mr. Shulman: All right, leaving this case aside for the moment, can the minister tell me what is the policy in relation to requests of this nature to find out whether retail sales tax has been paid?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, in following up an answer to a question or a discussion, or the dialogue which we had here earlier in the day, I would say it is not the policy of the department to let people know about the situation as to whether someone else has paid a tax or not. If we have information which leads us to believe that a tax has not been paid, it is our duty to find that out. But for us to engage in the business of having one citizen inquiring about whether another citizen has paid the certain tax or not, I think that the hon. member would agree that this opens a Pandora's box of everyone getting information on someone else, and all sorts of implications which I think would be unwise.

It is not the policy of the ministry to give information of this nature to people other than those immediately concerned. That is if a person is supposed to pay a tax and

hasn't, it is our responsibility to make sure that the proper tax is paid. If we have information from a third party which may lead us to believe that the proper tax has not been paid, then it is our responsibility to pursue it.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps it has come full circle or perhaps I don't understand the minister. The first thing I said when I stood up here, as you will recall—I was referring to my friend from Sandwich-Riverside to whom I have sold the car—I said if I wrote and asked if he had paid the retail sales tax would you let me know, and you said yes. Now are you telling me that since that time you have changed your mind and the answer is now no?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say that at all. I recall that I told the hon. member that it was his duty to advise us if he felt someone had not paid the tax. From there on, it is our baby.

Mr. Shulman: Is the minister saying he did not say he would inform him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is my—

Mr. Shulman: I mean, if I sell a car to my friend from Sandwich-Riverside and ask to see if he has paid the sales tax, you are saying now I cannot be so informed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I would say that's the policy at this time.

Mr. Shulman: I think you are going to find that you have taken a policy on both sides of the question but we will have to check Hansard.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I don't think so. It is not what I said. I said that the hon. member was not entitled to that information. We would appreciate getting the information and, as I say, from there on it is our responsibility.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the cost of collecting $100 of revenue in the security transfer tax. A major portion of that tax is almost collected by computer. A major portion of the revenues from security transfers have to do with the Toronto Stock Exchange and the regular stock exchanges—the Toronto Stock Exchange, of course, being the only one in this province which pays into it. Why would it cost so much to look after that aspect of tax collection? I think $3.70 per $100 is very high when you take a look at the very low cost of collecting from race tracks and the land transfer tax.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suppose the obvious answer is that the tax isn't very high. Therefore, relatively speaking the collection of the tax, the percentage involved in the collection of the tax, would be higher.

I am advised that it is not computerized. This is not computerized and that, of course, would raise the cost of collection.

Mr. Deacon: The reason—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Excuse me. If the hon. member will excuse me for a moment, I am also advised that it takes a lot more auditing than the average tax.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the reason I mention it is that I don't think it really does take that much more audit. I think there is an awful lot of time wasted in the audit in the way it is done, having watched the tax people come in periodically to the business I was connected with to do their audit. They will spend literally days finding 35 cents of revenue. That is about all they would find in the end.

Certainly, I think much greater use could be made of spot-checking and doing only spot-checks. In connection with the stock exchange which is the main place I would think—by far the largest source of revenue of this tax—it is done almost automatically. As we turn out our contract notes the tax is already in there. If you are trying to audit the computers, I would think the odd check here and there would do it, but it is a completely automatic process.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has raised a question which was brought to my attention by an acquaintance of mine a very short while ago. Because of the pressure of time I haven't had an opportunity to go into this whole matter.

This is probably an area in which we should refine the auditing procedure and the collection procedure generally. I should remind the hon. member, too, that earlier I had announced that we are setting up a special committee on taxation and this will be one of the terms of reference. One of the terms of reference of the committee will be to make sure that these anomalies do not exist.

An exhibition went on just before the dinner recess in respect of my attempt to explain the very complicated methods of the collection of the gasoline tax, which was one

of the things which motivated me to bring this to a head by having all these taxes examined by a qualified committee so that we could bring in a more rational system of collecting some of these taxes. The subject matter which the hon. member raised has concerned me and this will receive our attention.

Mr. Deacon: I suggest the minister get a little advice from the Stock Exchange and the Investment Dealers Association in this regard. I am sure he will find they have some valuable ideas which they can contribute to lowering the cost of this audit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This minister does not intend to engage in any kind of administration of taxes of any kind unless he discusses it with those people who are—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is noble!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say it was noble. The hon. member, who has just had his regular evening—

Mr. Singer: Yes? Come on, come on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —allotment of peanuts is now getting loquacious in a situation where he doesn't have to be. It was his colleague who asked the question.

Mr. Sargent: The minister hasn't seen anything yet.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and he asked a very legitimate question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's right and I gave him a very legitimate answer. I said to him that we don't intend to go ahead with any new methods of administration, or any changes of the administration of taxation without discussing it with those people who are going to be affected by it. Now, is there anything out of the ordinary in answering that legitimate question with the kind of answer I've given?

Mr. Singer: Yes, because the minister avoids.

Mr. Shulman: Not this time anyway.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, what is the hon. member getting so excited about?

Mr. Singer: Because the minister avoids. The minister insults. And the minister tried to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, why the hon. member for York Centre feels that I have insulted him or, in any way, not answered his question properly, because he was the one who asked the question. May I ask the hon. member for York Centre his views on that?

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I am looking forward to the minister coming in with new methods so that next year we will see a reduction in costs to under one per cent.

Mr. Singer: Some initiative from this minister would be welcome, yes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Singer: He has as much imagination as a mud hen.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): On land.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to revert to the question of the member for High Park. While the minister is checking out the practicability of his problem, would he accept—and give me an answer on my theory, which I expect has been the practice—that under the Act, the registrar of motor vehicles, when used vehicles change hands, is responsible for collecting the sales tax? If one goes to obtain the transfer of ownership, if he hasn't a receipt of the tax being paid, it is assessed at the sales price and must be paid before he gets the transfer. That is the advice that I have given to several people and I hope that that is correct and I would like to know if that is the correct procedure?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is correct. That is their responsibility unless the transaction has been made at a dealer's, because they will do this, but it is the registrar's responsibility in those instances.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, that is correct. If it's bought from the dealer, he puts on the bill of sale the tax collected and then forwards it to the department.

Mr. Shulman: Well, if it's the registrar's responsibility why would there be so much difficulty in checking something like this as apparently your officials feel?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is why I'm going to look into this.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that is very noble, that's very noble.

Mr. Shulman: During the estimates or during the question period?

Mr. Singer: No, he has got so much to do he is going to look into it after it's over.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member asked me whether I'm going to look into it during the estimates—

Mr. Shulman: I asked when you would advise us or advise me of the results of your looking into it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, just as soon as I have the opportunity to do it.

Mr. Singer: Oh, you are so busy?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know whether I'll have an opportunity to do it during the estimates. Hopefully, I will be able to.

Mr. Singer: Yes, you're so occupied.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You've embarrassed your leader again; he had to leave you.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I know he did, I know he did. You're an embarrassment to your government, constantly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm such an embarrassment that it's my 12th year in this House.

Mr. Deans: It's not our fault.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The member for Wentworth has the floor.

Mr. Deans: Don't blame us for that. We've tried.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know you have.

Mr. Deans: I want to ask you whether or not you have given consideration to eliminating the tax on used clothing?

It may be a policy matter over which you have absolutely no control, but there was a matter brought to the attention of a number of us, not too long ago, that a great many people who fall into the category of being low-income earners purchase used clothing. Much of the used clothing that they purchase is donated by other people to a variety of different organizations, without any charge. It then is cleaned, and stitched, and fixed up by people who are handicapped, and provides a very modest income for them. From that, there is the sale to, generally speaking, the extremely low-income groups. And they have to pay sales tax.

It isn't a lot, and I realize that, but nevertheless, no matter how little it is, it's more than they can afford under the circumstances. And I wondered if the minister has ever given consideration to recommending that, in the area of used clothing, there be an elimination of sales tax?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suppose I could say that's policy but I don't think it is really that big that it's important enough.

I must say that I am rather sympathetic to the idea, although I haven't thought of it before. When we are talking about used clothing we are usually talking about people who, if they are buying used clothing are doing it because they are not in the economic brackets which we want to tax.

On the other hand, it's like many other aspects of retail sales tax; it's an utter impossibility to devise a system which is completely just and fair. I am sure the hon. member appreciates that. Wherever you have the line of demarcation there are going to be some injustices. For example, off the top of my head I can think of one problem here. Suppose someone is selling a $10,000 mink coat that they have had for two or three years, and—

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on, come on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member who asked me the question apparently thinks it's serious enough to listen to it, and to listen to the answer.

I am sure this is an example of the sort of thing you get involved in. However, having said that, I must say I am sympathetic to the problem—

Mr. Sargent: Who is buying the fur coat?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and I think it is another thing that the taxation commitee could very well look into.

Mr. Deans: Yes. Just a final word to bring to a close what I want to say about it. It just strikes me that most of these things are sold through places like the Amity, or sold through a variety of organizations, and the organization may well be made exempt for the purpose of sales tax on the sale of used clothing, and that eliminates it altogether. You don't have to go through any of the formalities then.

They are not likely, I don't think, to be handling $10,000 fur coats. In fact, they are not even likely to be handling anything of any great consequence since it is being

given away in the first place. They don't buy anything. They only handle stuff which has been donated free of charge initially. I don't know anyone who is likely to be giving away anything of any particularly great value to begin with.

The bit of work that they put into it probably serves a three-fold purpose. It enables people to put used clothing to good use without throwing it out, stuff that may be either out of style, or for some reason or other they don't particularly want to wear any more. It provides some work for people who have physical disabilities, and, in some instances, mental disabilities. They are able to work in the enclosed shelter-workshop atmosphere and repair the articles of clothing and put them back on sale. And it provides clothing for low-income groups at a cost that they can afford, clothing which, in fact, may well be a little better than they could afford if they had to go into the store and buy it new. It is a better quality, because it probably was purchased by someone for considerably more than they are paying for it.

So it just strikes me that we might be able to make some kind of exemption for those kinds of organizations for the sale of the articles, rather than try to break it down from one into the other.

The other thing I want to raise with the minister in the area of sales tax is related to the machinery tax rebate. I wonder if the minister is able to tell us how much money was realized last year from the tax on production machinery in the Province of Ontario. Does this come under this vote?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, all sales tax would come under this vote.

Mr. Deans: Yes, I thought it would. You are able to do that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This, of course, would come about through the corporation tax.

Mr. Deans: Corporation tax?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, because the returns are filed by the corporations and it would be contained within their returns, obviously, because it is an exemption, it is an allowance, a tax credit, within the corporation tax. So we'd have to wait for their returns, and presumably there'd be some method of extracting this from the corporation tax returns to get the information the hon. member seeks.

This is the first year, isn't it? We'll have to wait for the closing of the corporation taxation year, because they all have different fiscal years, and those who finish their fiscal year at the end of December would be coming in about the end of June. I suppose we could get this information out of those corporation tax returns.

Mr. Deans: Yes. I am just a little puzzled. I am curious to know how it fits into the corporate tax. I thought it was, in fact, a machinery sales tax, and that it was a purchase—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Deans: No, I realize it's not a retail sales tax of the type we were talking about before, but I understood that it was, in fact, a sales tax that the purchaser paid on machinery which he purchased, based on the price or value of machinery purchased?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Deans: No?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that is not true; they have to claim the credit when they are putting in their return. They don't pay a sales tax any other way.

Mr. Deans: They don't pay sales tax on machinery?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They pay it when they buy the machinery.

Mr. Singer: I had better listen a bit more carefully.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When they buy the machinery they pay the sales tax.

Mr. Deans: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In their corporation returns they apply for a credit; they show it as a credit in their returns. So we would have to wait until the corporation supplies its return at the end of its fiscal year.

Mr. Deans: Well, there must be some check and balance system, though, that enables your department, which collects the sales tax in the first place, to determine the validity of the claim for a rebate on the corporation tax.

Mr. Singer: You presume that is logical?

Mr. Deans: You would think that there would be some paper work or communication between your department and some other department of government, or perhaps between

the retail sales branch and the corporation sales branch, to show that certain companies had paid sales tax on machinery purchased during the year 1971—

Mr. Singer: The member makes a very good point.

Mr. Deans: —and that they were claiming —it's a tough night—a percentage return from the corporation tax.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the corporation tax is paid to the Ministry of Revenue.

Mr. Deans: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When they supply us with their returns, they apply for a tax credit. At that stage it will be decided whether in fact they are entitled to that tax credit. At that time we will also know precisely how much was involved in the tax credits.

Mr. Deans: Do you understand, though, that what I'm getting at is this: They apply for a tax credit. They send in a form that states X number of dollars were paid out in sales tax for machinery purchased. There's got to be a check of that somewhere; you're obviously not going to just write out a cheque and say, "Here you are. Thanks very much for the information." You're going to have to check it against something else.

Last year, my recollection is that in the budget we did in fact pay out in the Province of Ontario a sum of money—

Mr. Singer: Substantial!

Mr. Deans: A substantial sum—between $80 million and $100 million.

Mr. Haggerty: The minister should have those figures.

Mr. Singer: The minister should have those figures.

Mr. Deans: We paid out between $80 million and $100 million to the companies for purchases which they presumably made during the last year. Now how did they justify the receipt of that money? That's what I'm really after.

Mr. Singer: Very good question.

Mr. Deans: How did they come to you and say that they are justified in asking for the money back? I really do need that information before I can proceed, because I want to know more about the filing of those returns.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): If you sit, maybe he will stand.

Mr. Singer: He might have an answer. He's been studying this over the supper hour.

Mr. Roy: You say, "I don't know."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm not quite sure what the hon. member's driving at. It seems to me—

Mr. Singer: No, it is very complicated!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, would you ask the hon. member for Downsview—I love him dearly, but—

Mr. Singer: Why are you embarrassed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He's not doing himself any credit. Why don't you take that up with him?

Mr. Singer: Oh, I know that. I've embarrassed my leader, who wasn't here, and I'm now embarrassing you. Answer the question!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He's not embarrassing me. The hon. member is embarrassing all his colleagues.

Mr. Singer: It's a very simple question. Answer it.

An hon. member: We are not embarrassed.

Mr. Singer: Answer it without consultation. Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's your time.

Mr. Singer: Or with consultation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That clock's running. It's your time.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I know that. That embarrasses me no end. Answer the question!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Singer: It's a very simple question. Answer it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that there is no difficulty in being able to check those who have paid the sales tax on machinery, as against those who are applying for credit in their returns. If there appears to be some way in which

there happens to be a gap here that I'm not aware of and my people are not aware of, we'll find out. Does the hon. member know of any cases?

Mr. Deans: No. What I'm trying to point out, quite frankly—I just can't find the figure here; it may not even be in here—is that in the budget for this year we set aside an amount of $150 million for machinery tax rebate. Last year, when the bill was introduced into the House, we set aside $125 million for the same purpose. That was in the last session prior to the election in 1971.

Presumably, if I read the budget statement correct, and if I recall what I read, we paid out something between $80 million and $100 million to the various companies who purchased machinery during that period up to the end of March, 1972. We obviously must have paid it out under some programme. Now, in order to qualify for that, those companies would have to come to the government and substantiate (a) that they purchased the machinery, and (b) that they paid tax on it. And that must be substantiated through your department. Right?

What I want to find out from you is, what kinds of calculations you go through to determine which companies are eligible to receive what proportion of that $125 million last year and that $150 million this year, and what kinds of checks and balances there are to make sure that we, in fact, are not paying out money without suitable justifictaion by the various companies involved.

But I want to go beyond that, because it's important to me. During the time that we debated the value of that particular legislation—it was brought into the House as a measure to provide employment, if you recall, and it was debated rather strongly from time to time—

Mr. Singer: Right. How many jobs?

Mr. Deans: —as to the merits of the jobs that this would produce. I would like to know, in the reporting forms that are used by your department to determine the sales tax, whether the type and location of manufacture of the equipment is, in fact, asked for, so that we can determine what kind of machinery is being purchased, the purpose to which it's being put and where it was manufactured, and so that we can then follow up as any loyal opposition should—

Mr. Singer: Right.

Mr. Deans: And find out—

Mr. Singer: How many jobs—

Mr. Deans: —how many new jobs we have created in the Province of Ontario with this $80 million to $125 million.

Now, let me sit down. Maybe your department officials can inform you of the forms that are used by your department, in order that we can justify the expenditure of that money.

Mr. Singer: Very good series of questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't feel that there is anything in the Corporation Tax Act that would require a company to give that kind of information. I question, too—

Mr. Singer: Oh come on. You are running around in circles.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I question, too, even if there were provisions for that in the corporation tax returns, whether there's any way in which you could gauge precisely how much this particular programme would have provided by way of jobs.

Mr. Deans: Let me decide—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's like a lot of other incentives that governments provide in the field of industry, which logic tells you will help provide a fillip to industry to provide jobs, and help the economy generally. Whether you could really establish what this particular programme has provided by way of jobs, I question very much. But in any case, I would doubt whether it's a proper question to expect companies to answer, in their corporation tax return, as such.

Mr. Singer: You said that—but why are you doing it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Insofar as checking is concerned, as to whether they're entitled to the tax credit, in view of the fact that they're both handled by the same ministry, there'd be no problem in checking. I take it for granted that this is checked by the staff of the ministry, because certainly they check all of the matters of tax returns, and credits, involving that particular ministry.

Mr. Deans: I'm sure the minister agrees with me that in spite of all the goodwill and things that we feel around this Legislature this particular session, that really isn't adequate. It's not quite enough. During the time

in the fall of last year when we were debating this bill rather strenuously, the claims from the government were such as to make me ask, now, for justification. The only way that I can get that justification, strange though it may seem, is through the Ministry of Revenue. The other departments of government are unable to provide us with any kind of substantiation for the claims as to employment opportunities and what—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How can we do that?

Mr. Deans: No, well I am going to tell you how you can do it. First of all, if you can tell me exactly what the reporting procedure is for the companies claiming the rebate, and what the amount of money was that they claimed, and on what machinery—and obviously you are not going to hand it out unless the company provides you with some detailed explanation of the kind of mahinery it purchased in order to qualify; you are surely not going to hand it out without that—if you can tell me that, then I can tell you with a very quick look at the statistics whether or not that company's employment record has improved or has not improved in the last year.

I can tell you whether the money that we are putting into the economy is producing jobs or whether it is not producing jobs. And I can go further than that. I can tell you, if you tell me the kind of equipment that is purchased and the manufacturer of the equipment, whether or not the equipment—even the manufacture of the equipment itself —produced any jobs.

This is the kind of statistics that I would have hoped the government, not necessarily this minister, but this minister for the time being, would be prepared to provide for us. We have got to know. If we are going to spend $150 million subsidizing corporations in the Province of Ontario through a machinery tax rebate, then we want to know first of all the justification for the payment; we want to know the location of the companies involved; we want to know the kinds of equipment purchased; and whether, in fact, it was a simple matter of automation of plants, which, in fact, does not produce more jobs but rather produces fewer jobs; whether the equipment that was purchased was manufactured in Canada or outside the country, to see whether or not that particular equipment produced any jobs in Canada.

I want to know from the minister, and I have to know from the minister, what it is that happens within his department that enables him to justify, if you like, or to provide the authority to whoever makes the payment —your friend, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) perhaps—what it is that you use to justify the Treasurer sending a cheque out to company A or company B or company C in payment for machinery tax which has been paid by them to the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, again I must repeat to the hon. member that this tax credit has only been in effect since a year ago April.

Mr. Singer: Yes, a full year. Twelve months.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So obviously—

Mr. Sargent: It served its purpose.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —we wouldn't have any figures as yet.

Mr. Singer: Why?

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, you paid all—I am sorry, I said $80 million; my leader tells me you paid out $30 million.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, last year—

Mr. Deans: So you must have done it, you must have a mechanism.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wonder if the hon. member would give me a chance. It has only been in effect since a year ago April. The hon. member is quite right, we should have and we will have the figures as to how much tax credit was applied for. We will, of course, have the machinery to find out whether, in fact, they are entitled to it, and whether, in fact, they received it. Having said that, to go beyond that, there is nothing else that my ministry can do as far as jobs are concerned.

Mr. Singer: Oh come on. Oh come on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We don't have the right to ask them that.

Mr. Singer: Why don't you? It is the whole object of the exercise.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Our job is to make sure that those who—Can't you do anything with him, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Singer: That was the whole object of the exercise.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. Roy: He is picking on you, is he?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The machinery is there to get the information, but not the information the hon. member has asked for about how many jobs are provided. He said he doesn't need that anyway. He says if we find out those who applied for the tax credit and were granted the tax credit, they won't be getting a cheque from the Treasurer, they will get a credit against their tax.

Mr. Deans: Well that is fine. It is the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Fine, and when he has that information he feels that is all the information he needs to satisfy himself as to how many jobs generally, I suppose, will have been generated by the tax credit. And he will have that information as soon as there is sufficient—

Mr. Singer: Oh come on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —there is sufficient volume to provide that information. I don't know how many returns would have been in by now because it is only a year ago April since it went into effect. And as soon as we have some figures of that nature, presumably—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): But that is all on the books now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it has not necessarily been compiled, and we are trying to compile as much of it as we can to give the hon. member as much information as we can within a reasonable length of time.

Mr. Lewis: With respect, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am amazed really at the ignorance of the minister. The minister is asked—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I am glad you're amazed.

Mr. Singer: —a reasonable question, a reasonable series of questions, by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth.

A year ago April—14 months ago—the government said, "Give us five per cent rebate in corporation tax—$150 million worth—we are going to provide lots of jobs for the people of Ontario." Now the hour of reckoning comes, on June 6, 1972, and the minister says, "I don't really know, we haven't assembled the figure."

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the hour of reckoning comes sometime to this government—even to this ignorant minister. Surely sometime the minister should stand in his place or one of his colleagues should stand in his place and say, "This is what we achieved by rebating to a select group of taxpayers of the Province of Ontario, $150 million of money."

There is a fascinating editorial in the Globe and Mail this morning entitled "Signifying Nothing." It quotes some fantastic words mentioned by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch), and it reminds me of what this minister said tonight. Let me read these—I think these should be on our record. The secretary said, talking about that wonderful congress the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick was so proud about:

> Our response to the developments which lay behind this congress must continuously begin anew. We must see our role in terms of facilitating a provincial response which will itself form a distinctively Canadian heritage for tomorrow, making full use of the human and cultural resources in our midst.

Now, these are two very significant sentences. Let me read what the very intelligent editor of the Globe and Mail had to say:

> You can't blame the WASPs—

I presume that is—well, WASP, I'll let you interpret that for yourself.

> —for that. It isn't the language of Shakespeare, Milton or Chaucer or any of the other giants of English literature. Some of the words may have been theirs but the total absence of meaning clearly belongs to another culture.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that the total absence of meaning produced by this minister tonight in response to the very logical questions of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth typifies the kind of comment that brought on this editorial. The minister is not able to tell us what he did by giving away $150 million, presumably. There are no records, there are no programmes of performance, there is no idea of how many jobs were provided, if any at all. The minister gives us a bunch of gobbledegook about what in fact was intended or what in fact was

produced. He hides behind the shelter of the fact that he is only the collector.

Granted the minister is not the policy maker. But somewhere along the line, if the minister is going to venture into the idea that government programmes are in fact justified, then somewhere along the way he has to say, "This programme was justified because we provided X jobs or Y benefits to the people of the Province of Ontario."

The fact is, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lewis: Or Z fringes.

Mr. Singer: Or Z fringes, I don't care. But the minister, having ventured upon some kind of a defence, should present some kind of a justification.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the minister presents nothing. If the minister wants to retire behind the cloak, perhaps he is justified in saying, "I only collect, I don't know. My colleague the Treasurer has to explain. He levied, he gave away, he forgave $150 million, he has to explain."

But this minister isn't satisfied with that. He pretends that he can justify, and he pretends on no basis that makes any sense at all. This minister has been asked some pertinent questions, and he denies any pertinent answers. Surely, Mr. Chairman, the minister tonight either has to retire to his cloak of saying, "I have no responsibility other than to collect, and if I collect honestly or my officials collect honestly that is it," or if he tries to protect the government then he has to defend, and he should bring before us statistics.

If he tells us it only started a year ago April—which is 14 or 15 months ago—then surely he should bring before us some figures. How many jobs did you provide by giving away $150 million? What really did you achieve? Why did you justify all the contributions my friend from Owen Sound, talks about? You got them and you know you got them from big industry because you gave away some money, a lot of money.

Surely the minister can't have it both ways. If he is the collector only, then let him say that that is it and he doesn't understand, he doesn't know. But if he is going to try and defend, let's not give us the gobbledegook that the Globe and Mail was complaining about this morning. That is all he has given us tonight and that was all he was giving us this afternoon. This minister is the minister of gobbledegook, and it is about time he gave us some explanations.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, as I recall when the budget was initially introduced, the programme was a tax credit of a quarter of a billion dollars. The first year it was to provide $125 million by way of rebate and a similar amount the second year.

Much to the astonishment of the government itself, I think, the first year resulted in only $30 million being applied for by way of tax rebate. In this year's budget $130 million has been budgeted for by way of anticipated tax rebate.

I think my colleague from Wentworth has posed the appropriate question. The $30 million which was received by way of tax rebate or credit by the corporations should surely be accounted for. There has to be some mechanism within the Minister of Revenue's department where that $30 million is precisely tabulated.

I must admit I am not at all clear in my own mind what the process is. But the $30 million figure was specifically provided to the House by the provincial Treasurer, based on a fiscal year conclusively past, the returns for which are now before the Ministry of Revenue. The components which comprise the $30 million are in the hands of the provincial Minister of Revenue. There must surely be some explanation to the House of how it was tabulated, from which companies it came.

I will concede that it is difficult for this minister to estimate the number of jobs. You could clearly do it by virtue of cabinet meetings. You can say you can't do it because it isn't your purview. But clearly within your purview, Mr. Minister, is to account for the $30 million, and how you came to that amount, and how you granted that rebate to the companies involved, and which companies were involved, and give us the details which you necessarily have. Otherwise the provincial Treasurer could not use the figure with such authority.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have offered to get this information for the hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Singer: Oh come on. How can you come before the House without this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for Downsview in his words suggests that I am an ignorant minister. I may be ignorant but at least I don't come into this House acting like a lout.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege. I ask that the minister be instructed to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview. Your point of privilege?

Mr. Singer: I ask that the minister be instructed to withdraw that remark. That was quite unparliamentary. The minister, being in ignorance of his responsibilities to this House, has no recourse bu to resort to personal insults. I would ask that either the minister withdraw, or that you instruct him to withdraw.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Did the minister say "louse" or "lout"?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I didn't know that the hon. member was so sensitive — that he thought that the word "lout" was worse than calling a minister ignorant. He did not in fact say that the minister was ignorant. He in fact said—and I paid close attention to it—"this ignorant minister." That is what he said.

An hon. member: Right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I didn't call the hon. member a lout. I merely said I didn't come in here acting like a lout. If the hon. member has a guilty conscience, that's his business.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. Lewis: If any member is sensitive enough to feel that the shoe fits—

Mr. Chairman: Words have been used profusely by the hon. member for Downsview against the minister. He has reciprocated. I think it would be appropriate if you both retracted your remarks.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if you feel that anything I have said has been unparliamentary—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I called nobody a lout.

Mr. Singer: —I will withdraw. I am sorry that the minister is so ignorant as to use the kind of language he has used in this reference.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is what I call a qualified withdrawal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what I am to withdraw. I didn't call the hon. member a lout. I merely said I didn't come in acting like a lout.

An hon. member: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If he thinks it applies to him, then I am terribly sorry, and I apologize.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: We will return to item 5.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Wentworth asked a question. It was a logical question, it was an intelligent question, it was a pertinent question, and I can't give him the information—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —off the top of my head. The only thing I did tell him was that I couldn't—as a matter of fact, I don't know how anyone could give him exact details as to how many people would have been employed because of the tax credit—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and we'll find out about the $30 million credit—

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order.

An hon. member: Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —which was apparently referred to in the tables in the budget—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —I will tell him that in my view, it is too early because it was only—

Mr. MacDonald: Not for the $30 million.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Even though it started a year ago April, most of companies have their fiscal years ending Dec. 31. Their returns wouldn't be in until the end of June. I will find out what we have to date, by way of the information the hon. member seeks, and let him have the information.

Mr. MacDonald: When?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know when I can do it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce has got a point of order. Your point of order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —I don't know quite frankly—

An hon. member: Not Huron-Bruce; Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Chairman: Grey-Bruce.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know—

Mr. Sargent: It would seem to me that this minister has about $100,000 of talented civil servants in front of him. Why can't he furnish the House with the information we ask him for?

Mr. Chairman: What's your your point of order?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: These people are paid a handsome salary to furnish information. If they don't know the answers tonight they won't know them next week.

Mr. Chairman: This particular question was asked by the member for Renfrew. The minister has offered to give him the information. So there is no point of order, really.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Just a second, that is a palpable slander.

Mr. Deans: On a point of privilege, the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Chairman: Wentworth. I am sorry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): I am happy to represent the great county of Renfrew, which I visited today by the way.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): There has been a lot of peanut-eating here.

Mr. Chairman: I have to apologize to the hon. member for Wentworth. I had seen somebody else standing here.

Mr. Deans: Yes, I just wanted to complete this.

Mr. Gisborn: On this same point—

Mr. Chairman: Yes, okay.

Mr. Deans: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Gisborn: It may be hard for the minister to answer the specifics of the question before us, but would the minister at least tell the House what his idea is of the mechanism of the industries collecting the five year per cent tax rebate on machinery?

Mr. Deans: How does it work?

Mr. Gisborn: Surely he has some idea. Do they get it and deduct it when they make their purchase? Is that allowed under the Act? Do they pay the tax and then make application for the rebate? Tell us what the mechanism is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am terribly sorry. I thought I had made that clear. They pay the tax, the retail sales tax to the retail sales tax branch. Oh, I am sorry. They pay it to the company from which they buy it, of course. Then it comes into the department. Then they apply for a tax credit when they file their corporation tax return. At that stage their return is checked to see whether, in fact, they have paid it, and whether they are entitled to it.

Mr. Deans: Well, let me ask naively, what happens if they buy it from a company in Los Angeles? How then do they—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I suppose that is checked.

Mr. Deans: Well, no, if they pay it to the company from which they purchased the machinery, then who does that vendor pay it to?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They bring it in. It doesn't make any difference where they bring it, of course. They have to pay the tax here. They have to pay the tax to us. The hon. member goes across the border, for example, and brings something back across the border; if he's importing something, he's supposed to pay the tax here. That, of course, will come into the Ministry of Revenue.

Mr. Deans: That must be done more directly than the other way; let's be fair about it. In the case of a manufacturer of machinery in Ontario, the purchase would be made from that manufacturer; that manufacturer would file his returns. The purchaser would have to file a request with the depart-

ment—some kind of a form in the department —to claim it back. Right?

He would have to file with the department that he had paid X number of dollars in retail sales tax to company X and company X had, in turn, paid it to the government. They take it back again and hand it back to the first guy. This is the mechanism? It's an awfully complicated machinery.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe I know so little about it that it seems simple to me. You pay your tax and when you send in your corporation tax returns, you apply for a credit for the tax which you have paid. If you're entitled to it, you're allowed the tax. That seems to me to be fairly simple.

It's just the same when you're submitting your corporation tax return and you claim as an expense some ordinary purchase. You say, 'We're entitled to this as a charge against the operations of our business. We spent $50,000 for flooring," or something of that nature. It's put into your return.

I presume, too, that all corporation tax returns are not checked in detail. You take it for granted that because somebody has signed his name to a corporation tax return he knows he is committing a criminal offence if he is signing his name—

Mr. Sargent: But to qualify, they must have your approval.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to something which is incorrect. If we had to check, I suppose, all of the tax returns, we wouldn't have enough staff. I presume, to some extent, some of this is taken on the fact—

Mr. Deans: An honour system.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not an honour system at all. There's no honour involved when a man signs his name and says, "I certify that these are facts" knowing he could perhaps get five years' imprisonment if this turns out to be incorrect. We've had cases like that—

Mr. Deans: What I mean is there is no direct check.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You can check, check check until it costs you more to check the returns than you're getting in revenue. All I can say to the hon. member is that I will go into the matter he has raised. If I am satisfied that the system is sufficiently efficient to do the job that it's supposed to do, fine. If it isn't, it will be changed, if it is possible to change it. I don't know what else I can add to that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Yes. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, if one can go off this topic of the tax rebate on machinery. I had a couple of points to make on the question of the retail sales tax and other taxes. Prior to going into these particular points, I would like to make a general comment to the minister and quote some of the things he's said today.

You said earlier in a statement that what you've been doing this afternoon and this evening was an exhibition. I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that it's exactly what it has been—an exhibition—because we've not really been getting any answers. It's hardly fair for us to move No. 1 to No. 2 and now we're down to No. 5. Really, on many of these points, we've not had any answers.

I think the member for Grey-Bruce certainly made a good point when he said that when the minister—and I appreciate that this is a new ministry for this particular minister—

Mr. Sargent: No, it isn't.

Mr. Roy: —in these circumstances your staff or the people who are here—and underneath the galleries is full of, I'm sure, very competent people—how come we're not getting the answers? For instance, when the member for Waterloo mentioned about the taxes on gasoline, we could not get the answers. I suggest to you that if we don't do our job—

Mr. Chairman: Would the member like to relate to item 5?

Mr. Roy: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: You're privileged to do so—

Mr. Roy: Surely I can make a general comment, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: We're not dealing with generalities. We're dealing with item 5.

Mr. Roy: Pardon me?

Mr. Chairman: We're dealing with item 5, retail sales tax and other taxes.

Mr. Roy: Yes. I was just dealing with a general comment. I'm not permitted to do that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: No, not on item 5. You're not permitted general comments.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I intend to go into item 5, but I've not had a chance to speak to the other items, and I suggest to you we have not had answers on the other items in any event.

But the point I would like to make to the minister is simply this: I understand that for certain people getting into certain types of businesses, where they are going to be collecting sales tax, you require that they sign a bond or something, when they start into business, to guarantee that the sales tax will be paid.

The first question I would like to ask is, is that a fact? Second, who determines the types of individuals of whom you are going to be requiring a bond or some guarantee? I have had a number of complaints about this, that there are certain people from whom you would require certain guarantees before you would allow them to collect the retail sales tax, and certain other people from whom you would not. I've had great difficulty in understanding the policy or finding out who in fact is exercising that discretion.

That is the first point, Mr. Chairman. The second one is that I understand the system of retail sales tax was changed two or three years ago and that certain individuals, at least in eastern Ontario, required assistance from some of your field offices down there as to how the system really operated. They were not able to get this particular assistance. They apparently called your department on a number of occasions. What happened, in fact, is that some of your people came into their offices and said simply: "You're not following the proper system. You owe us somewhere in the neighbourhood of about $4,000."

I am wondering whether you have sufficient staff in your field offices outside of the metropolitan area to be of assistance to many people who are requiring this assistance and who are honest citizens. They aren't trying to take anything away from the department or anything else. It is simply that they didn't know the full technicalities of the system, they apparently made some mistakes and your officers came along and said: "Well, you owe us so much money." I would like some answers on these two questions, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The last question first. Is the hon. member asking me whether in fact our people are dealing in a courteous manner with requests from citizens?

Mr. Roy: No, I'm not suggesting that they are not courteous. What I was suggesting is that when these individuals apparently attempted to get some assistance after the system was changed, it wasn't that they weren't dealt with courteously—they weren't dealt with at all. They didn't get any answers to their requests.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would say that would be discourtesy, at least.

Mr. Roy: Well, you and I won't get along on the definitions of words I'm sure. They weren't dealt with at all. I don't know whether they were courteous or not. In any event, when they were dealt with, they were simply told, "You owe the department $3,000 or $4,000."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised to hear the hon. member's comment on this. Of course, he said there is a question of definition as to what is discourtesy. I would say that if you don't attend to somebody's requests for information and for some assistance, it is a form of discourtesy; of course it is.

Quite frankly, if there is anything about the Department of Revenue which has pleased me it is that practically everyone with whom I've had contact and dealt has remarked upon the courteous manner in which they have been treated by the staff.

In this particular situation the hon. member is talking about, I would be pleased to find out whether that situation existed and, if so, whether it still exists. I'll go into that. If the hon. member has a specific case in mind, I would be pleased if he would let me have it. Of course, we would be interested in looking after that.

Insofar as bonding is concerned, bonding is required if a new member applies for a permit and cannot provide evidence of financial stability, particularly if he is in a business that has no permanent establishment—some car dealers, some rug dealers, transient salesmen and so on. After all, there were 15,000 permits issued in a year and only four permits were denied.

I should tell the hon. member in respect of some of the other bonding that is required in some instances, we are looking at the question of those instances as to whether the bonding is necessary; and if so, whether they should be required to pay for the bonding themselves particularly in view of the fact that we have removed the re-

muneration. I think it would be only fair to consider that, except in cases where it applies to the odd instances of transient salesmen, things of that nature. After all, they will be handling government tax money, and in some cases, perhaps, some large sums as well.

Mr. Roy: I appreciate that, Mr. Minister. Could you give us some idea to justify this bonding procedure that you have? What percentage or how much money, for instance, in bad debts or debts that are delinquent, let us say, from the last fiscal year does that represent? Out of all the retail tax collected? Could you give me any percentage, any figures about bad debts or at least justify the bonding?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Good: The minister is going to answer this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that there was about $300,000 written off for bad debts. That will be on the amount of $800 million collected.

Mr. Roy: That will be what percentage?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's $300,000 over $800 million.

Mr. Roy: That is a very low percentage.

Mr. Lewis: I can't believe that you made that admission! I can't believe that of you.

Mr. Roy: I can't either.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that tonight we have asked the minister to provide this House with answers. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, if we don't get them tonight we will never get them. I have never yet seen the minister do that.

In his estimates, he says, "We will get that to the member," and so help me they never come through with the answer. In my eight or nine years, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen it. We are talking about retail sales tax here, on the fifth vote—

Mr. Shulman: A pretty good answer.

An hon. member: They never come either with the answers.

Mr. MacDonald: They cannot understand your question.

Mr. Yakabuski: Write a letter, that is a good idea.

Mr. Sargent: It is a complete farce that we go through this exercise. It is a further farce—I should be the last one to say this—it is an insult for any one of us in this House, in the opposition, to come in here and see no ministers over there. Who do they think they are?

Mr. Singer: Six Tories in the whole House.

Mr. Sargent: They can hold down a portfolio and find more important things to do than be in this House.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order, please! The hon. member—

Mr. Sargent: I am the last one who should say that now. I know it. Why should I be here if they are not?

Mr. Chairman: This has nothing to do with sales tax.

Mr. Sargent: I am going to talk! I say, Mr. Minister, we should have some answers but they will never give us the answers.

Mr. Singer: Right.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I want to, if I may—

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment. I want to make this point here.

Mr. Chairman: The member is certainly not on the estimates—

Mr. Sargent: The member for Downsview was pretty nearly correct when he said to this minister—because he is very arrogant—

Mr. Yakabuski: What did he say to the minister?

Mr. Sargent: He is very arrogant and he is close to being ignorant. If he tells me that we have had this effective since June 1, 1970, this tax rebate came into effect in the 25th month of the operation of this—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say that.

Mr. Sargent: I am saying it. It is in the Act here. It became effective over 25 months ago—June 1, 1970. It is on page 24 of your report, sir—

Mr. Roy: He's probably not read it.

Mr. Sargent: And you have the arrogance! In fact you are ignorant of your department, sir, if you can tell us that you don't know. It says here, that to qualify for exemption or for rebate these must conform with definitions made by the minister.

If you didn't make them, which of the three minions in front of you made the exemptions? It's a serious thing, Mr. Chairman, when we can sit here talking about untold millions of dollars that have been refunded to manufacturers under the guise of doing a job of hiring and giving people jobs. You used the people of Ontario in the election by this dodge. You haven't got the guts to come out and say, "Okay, we have spent this much money." I say that very safely—he hasn't got the guts to tell the people of Ontario what it costs them for you to make the election planks in your platform—and you don't know after 25 months?

It is disgraceful, Mr. Chairman, and I want the minister to stand on his feet and tell me why. He has three men in front of him who earn maybe more than $30,000 a year each; don't they know why this report can't be made available to the people, how much money has been returned or how many jobs have been created? We should know this before we can pass this vote.

It is complete arrogance, Mr. Chairman, that this minister is flaunting in front of the House when he says he doesn't know or he can't get the information. He has had 25 months to do it. And he must have made at least two levies against these firms, because we are in the 25th month now of the operation of this refund.

It's about time we had some straight answers and quit this nonsense of you being hurt because people tell you that you are ignorant—because you are ignorant of your department.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. minister wish to confess his ignorance or not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, he's got me scared.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York South. The hon. member for Sarnia is next after him.

Mr. MacDonald: My name has been on the list for quite some time. I hope the hon. member for Sarnia is not offended now.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am not offended. You are a pompous old man basically.

Mr. Singer: I'll be right back.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Don't rush.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a neat, tidy little question I want to ask the minister. How much money by way of retail sales tax did the government collect from voluntary contributions for out-of-province purchases?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About $700,000 a year.

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): A tidy answer.

Mr. MacDonald: Seven hundred thousand dollars a year? What proportion of the tax due do you consider that represents?

Mr. P. G. Givens (York - Forest Hill): One hundred per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That wasn't a tidy question, because how would we know that? How would we know how much was being avoided? Obviously there must be a lot of people coming across the border, with their $25 exemption, for example, who aren't paying the five per cent. Quite frankly, if we start pursuing that, it would probably cost us five times as much to collect it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let me try to break this down. How much of that $700,000 was by companies that were purchasing equipment or things of that nature which was easily traceable, and how much of it came from what might be described as the general citizenry of the province? Have you any such breakdown as that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That was revenue voluntarily declared by individuals on import items from outside the province. Approximately 80 per cent of this revenue is obtained by branch personnel as a result of follow-up of information received from Quebec under our reciprocal agreement and the regisration of out-of-province contractors. This revenue is obtained without assessment action.

Mr. MacDonald: Eighty per cent of it is the result of follow-ups from purchases in the Province of Quebec as a result of a reciprocal agreement?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a reciprocal agreement with them.

Mr. MacDonald: You have a reciprocal agreement, and 80 per cent of the $700,000 was collected because of information you got from Quebec? My curiosity grows greater and greater. What is the nature of this reciprocal agreement? Is it their retail sales tax department, or who in the Prov-

ince of Quebec informs you of purchases in the Province of Quebec by people in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is information on shipments that are made from Quebec to the Province of Ontario on which no tax has been collected there.

Mr. MacDonald: To individuals?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It could be individuals or companies, I guess—it's mostly individuals. We do the same for Quebec.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you mean to say that all the retailers in the Province of Quebec voluntarily, or by some channel, inform you that they are sending a parcel to the Province of Ontario and then 80 per cent of that $700,000 is collected at your regional offices, by pursuing these people? I'm sorry, I'm very dubious. This doesn't sound real.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member is suggesting that I'm suggesting we get the information of all the sales—we don't.

Mr. MacDonald: You said 80 per cent of that figure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, but 80 per cent of this revenue that we have comes from this source. That doesn't mean that we're getting the information on 80 per cent of the sales which are made in the Province of Quebec and shipped to Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Some of it is genuinely voluntary?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Some of it's genuinely voluntary; some of it we are informed of by the shippers.

Mr. MacDonald: I just want to make a brief comment, Mr. Chairman. I must say I'm a little surprised it's as high as $700,000, but I think all law is brought into disrepute if it is not enforceable in a relatively easy manner. Quite frankly, a significant proportion—I doubt whether anybody knows how high—of the general public doesn't even know this law. They innocently go out of the province, to Manitoba, or Quebec, or one of the American states, and they come back and, with no intent to defraud the public—they simply don't voluntarily do it; a lot of other people don't do it because, quite frankly, they think it's a wee bit absurd.

Mr. Good: Provincial trade barriers.

Mr. MacDonald: It's a wee bit absurd that the provincial government should expect an individual who has gone and made a purchase outside the province to voluntarily sit down and calculate it and send it into an office, the exact address of which he doesn't know.

Mr. Deans: Do you pay it if you've paid your tax in Quebec?

Mr. MacDonald: No, no. One of my colleagues said, "Do you pay it if you've paid the tax in Quebec?" If you buy in the Province of Quebec you're free of the Montreal tax, because it's shipped out, it's shipped to your home in the Province of Ontario. But if it's shipped, presumably you've got some way of tracing it, although my curiosity is still aroused as to the mechanism, as to how that information is passed on. Here's an underworld that I wasn't aware of altogether.

But for the people who buy it and bring it back here from an American state, or from Quebec, or from Manitoba, and voluntarily are supposed to send it in, my guess is that is peanuts, real peanuts. Most of your money is on things that were shipped in, so that you've got some sort of check—

Mr. Givens: A record.

Mr. MacDonald: Some sort of a record and some assistance from the out-of-province jurisdiction. Quite frankly I don't think it's a good law, because I think for the overwhelmingly majority of people who buy something and bring it in themselves, my guess would be—and I've no justification, I've no evidence for this—that 99 per cent of them, if not 99.9 per cent of them, out of ignorance, or out of thinking the law is a bit absurd anyway, don't bother sending it in voluntarily.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course I'll agree with the hon. member that it's a law which is very difficult, it is not enforceable—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, why have it then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know, but the hon. member has heard some of the debates here over the years, and I've heard them, in respect of retail tax. It's a very difficult tax to enforce right across the board with equal justice to all, if I may put it that way. We just have to go into the business of clothing and the size of clothing, and whether you tax soap, or toilet paper, Kleenex and all that sort of thing. I distinctly recall when

the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan)—

Mr. Deans: Have a look around, you will find him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —was the Treasurer, and he brought in the sales tax. I remember I sat listening and he told us all of the problems that are involved when you allow, for example, any kind of an exemption.

What the hon. member is actually saying is that there should be an exemption for people who bring things in from outside the province. I would suggest to the hon. member it doesn't take much imagination to think of what the import of his suggestion is. Are we to say then, if you buy anything out of the province and bring it in, there's no retail sales tax? Certainly he must know what the implications of that are. Nobody, particularly if they live near the border, would buy anything here. Well, I shouldn't say buy anything, but if it's a substantial sum involved they won't buy anything here at all, they'll cross the border. Obviously you can't make an exemption that way.

So all he is really pointing out is it would require a Solomon, if indeed a Solomon could resolve the problem, to provide for the kind of a retail sales tax law which would be equitable, just and not open to a certain amount of ridicule in some instances.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want, if I might, to deal for a moment with the collection by this department of the elevated land transfer tax.

As we all recognize, since the last provision of estimates for this department, we have elevated the land transfer tax and I would suggest to you that it is a significantly anomalous situation that now we are dealing with a ministry, which is vested with the responsibility of collecting this tax and is vested with the responsibility of housing in the Province of Ontario.

The fact of the matter is—and I want to tell you as a small practitioner in a comparatively small town in the Province of Ontario—this tax is a burden, an awesome burden, on the people who buy homes, those people who have attempted to scrape together a downpayment over years of mutual conjugal endeavour, and then they come into their lawyer's office and he tells them that in point of fact where they had a transfer tax of $60 to pay before, they now have a transfer tax of something in the neighbourhood of $94 to pay.

I think it is something of extreme importance because I think it really epitomizes basically the attitude and philosophy of this government and this minister, his associates, his Prime Minister (Mr. Davis), his Committee on Government Productivity, the technocrats, the bureaucrats, and every person who is associated with the policy of taxation in the Province of Ontario because—

Mr. Deans: The parliamentary secretaries.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right. The parliamentary secretaries too, we won't leave them out, because the fact of the matter is that they are prepared to impose this type of direct taxation upon the people who can ill-afford the tax, and they are prepared, concurrently with that, to permit trust companies—the federal government of this nation is prepared to permit the chartered banks, they are prepared to permit life insurance companies—to elevate their profits in an absolutely unconscionable fashion.

I want to read into the record right now, listen to this for a moment, Mr. Chairman, if I may: Royal Trust Co., 1970, before taxes, profits, $11,415,000; 1971, $16,818,000, an increase of 47 per cent. Montreal Trust, $2,139,000 in 1970. In 1971, $7,518,000, an increase in profit of 251 per cent, 251 per cent. Canada Trust Co., before taxes—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: It really is unfortunate that the members of the New Democratic Party do not, in the conscience that they attempt to publicly convey, recognize what I am saying now.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, the member is being pompous.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am not attempting to be pompous. I will never be a socialist. I say that the free enterprise system is the only system. I say the government has a concurrent obligation to see that there is equity and justice; equity and justice for corporations and for the individual. And I continue by saying this to you: that the Canada Trust Co., profits before taxes were $5,714,000 in 1970, elevated to $11,497,000 in 1971, an increase of 101 per cent in one fiscal year.

Now, there they are, Mr. Chairman and members of this House, there they are to see, to blatantly see. Increases in one year: Royal Trust, 47 per cent; Montreal Trust, 251 per cent; Canada Trust, 101 per cent.

And whom do we tax? Whom do we tax? We tax the people under the Land Transfer Tax Act. That's the philosophy of this government, that's the essence in effect—and you smile and you laugh—because, basically, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, I say to the minister through you, that this is exactly the philosophy: This vote that we are on now, the administration of the Land Transfer Tax Act, is a cornerstone of the taxing philosophy of this government.

They are in the hip pocket of the vested interests; they always will be in the hip pocket of the vested interests. They sit in magnificent profusion in this House because of the fact that it is those vested interests right there who back them up financially. And the same thing of course, applies with the chartered banks and the federal Liberals. They act the same way; they have no conscience for the people who must pay and must bear the burden. It is very, very easy to sit back in smugness and feel that this is equity and justice.

Mr. Lewis: There they are, the guilty men, the member for Algoma.

Mr. Bullbrook: The answer doesn't lie in socialism. It never will lie in socialism. The answer lies in a party that must of—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): You know me. You should not have said that.

Mr. Bullbrook: —necessity—

Mr. MacDonald: Like the federal Liberals.

Mr. Bullbrook: —convey that degree of equity to the people of Ontario and the people of Canada. They will do that, not by usurping the traditional free enterprise function—

Mr. Lewis: You can't say that—

Mr. Bullbrook: —but by recognizing that that type of unconscionable profit can never be concurrent with—

Mr. Lewis: But it is your party.

Mr. Bullbrook: —the burden that is placed upon the people of Ontario under the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Are you running for the leadership?

Mr. Bullbrook: We will not, I will not for one moment accept that type of philosophy. I have long ago abandoned any concept of leadership. Everyone in this House knows it. I am trying now sincerely to convey a feeling that I have, and a feeling that I would hope that members on this side of the House would have, that we cannot continue to tolerate governments which are permitting this type of licence.

Mr. MacDonald: That is why we are going to fight the federal Liberals and toss the rascals out.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why do we always have to besmirch ourselves Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MacDonald: Because you are doing the very same thing as you are deploring.

Mr. Givens: He just said so. Why don't you listen?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They don't listen.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why do we have to besmirch ourselves and misdirect our intent, because there is a communal intent here, an appropriate intent to try to—

Mr. Lewis: As long as it is communal and not conjugal.

Mr. Bullbrook: No; it isn't conjugal. The other was an effort that was conjugal, really.

Mr. Givens: Mutually conjugal.

Mr. Bullbrook: It really went to that type of enterprise as you recognize, because of those people who come in. I want to say to the leader of the New Democratic Party, whom I've found over the years recognizes the significance of the thrust that I am trying to put forward tonight—perhaps ineptly I don't know—that I am saying, in effect—

An hon. member: Never ineptly.

Mr. Bullbrook: —to the minister this, that I've seen the burden of this elevation of the tax, inconsequential in revenue as it is, because it is inconsequential and it means nothing in a $7 billion budget. This elevation of the land transfer tax means a burden of great consequence, almost beyond belief at times, to young couples when they come to buy their first home. An elevation of $30 or $40 to them sometimes is the make or break of their new enterprise in their married life. I don't dramatize unduly because that happens to me. I've seen them come into me and say, "Mr. Bullbrook you told

me I required $2,812, and I cannot give you $2,884."

That is the—

Mr. Deans: So you forget your fee.

Mr. Bullbrook: —type of tender enterprise that they are involved in. Now it takes them years to develop even the 10 per cent under a guaranteed loan—

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Bullbrook: —that they have to have. We talk about the need for public housing and I don't minimize that for one moment, Mr. Chairman. I am saying there are young people who are attempting with their own individual and collective effort together to acquire their home. These are the obstructions that we put in their place, the elevation of this type of tax, and we put it in the context of that type of profit increase. I say to you that I don't want ever to be a party to that.

I say, as I tried to convey tonight, there is certainly the same thing wrong with the federal government. You can talk about the same elevation. In the chartered banks' profits in the times of recession in this nation, in the times of recession in this province—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: —concurrently, there was an elevation of the profits of the chartered banks and the trust companies and the life insurance companies. The time has come in this province when we have to have a direction.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order—

Mr. Bullbrook: Never mind the point of order. We have to have a direction now. We have to have a direction that says, in effect, "Royal Trust Co., no more equity exercises." Manufacturers—"

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): He is on a point of order. You should sit down. Make him sit down.

Mr. Bullbrook: "—Life, no more equity exercises. From now on you will involve yourself—"

Mr. Chairman: Just speak strictly to the land transfer tax. You are making a very good speech but stick to that.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am going to say this to you, and I say this to you most respectfully—

Mr. Chairman: We are talking about tax policy.

Mr. Sargent: Right on target.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am talking of the imposition of an increase in the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: The fact of the matter is we seem to have been digressing all night.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it most unfair to the other members who wanted to discuss tax policy, when it was explained earlier in the estimates that there was no point in discussing it in my estimates since the tax policy is within the purview of the Treasurer and should be discussed during his estimates. I, and my ministry, are responsible for the administration of the taxes as laid out by the policy of the government and this will only be repeated, sir, during the estimates of the Treasurer. If you permit it now, as I say, it is most unfair to the other members who have abided by this.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well you see—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia—

Mr. Bullbrook: May I speak to the point of order? You see the fact of the matter is that the minister's advisers left him bereft of any argument that might contradict the position that I have taken. His opening statement dealt with nothing but succession duties, gift tax, the policy behind it—the very thing, the very policy, that is inherent in the tax legislation that he is administering. If he never opened his mouth there might be some validity in what he said. He talked about gift tax, he talked about succession duties and he talked about the imposition of those taxes in the context of a uniform gift tax Act, and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I intend to continue—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have the floor.

Mr. Singer: The minister's biggest problem is he opens his mouth, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And the hon. member for Downsview never does.

Mr. Singer: I don't know why you are so sensitive.

Mr. Chairman: Let's have a little order.

Mr. Bullbrook: I will not be deflected. This has to be said. These things, in my opinion, are of paramount importance to the people of Ontario because—

Mr. Shulman: But they are not relevant to these estimates.

Mr. Bullbrook: I suggest they are. I suggest, frankly, to my colleague from High Park that when people have to pay an increase in land transfer tax in connection with the acquisition of housing then it is part of the total burden they have in connection with the acquisition of that land. I say then to him, with the greatest respect, that I am entitled to talk about the profits that the trust companies acquire through elevated and inflated interest rates that are permitted by this government in its total tax policy, by the government of the Dominion of Canada in connection—

Mr. Chairman: No, you are not on these questions now, you are talking to the estimates—

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to say this to you, I am prepared to be ruled out of order, I have always abided by the rulings of this House. I am going to continue to speak about this until you rule me out of order. I don't invite that ruling. I don't want that ruling.

I am saying, in point of fact, that the elevation and collection of the increased land transfer tax epitomizes, to a great extent, what is happening in the Province of Ontario, from the point of view of fiscal policy, from the point of view of tax policy, from the point of view of the fact that they are a captured audience. Galbraith, two weeks ago gave a speech in Montreal, where the report says this: "Galbraith criticized the close relationship between corporate executives and senior civil servants that exists in most modern industrial countries—"

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia is out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: "This group, the technostructure, constitutes a powerful planning aid that distorts government spending programmes and bypasses Parliament and legislature."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia is out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: The fact of the matter is that this is true.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Sit down a moment.

Mr. Bullbrook: This type of land transfer tax, Mr. Chairman, this type of land transfer tax—

Mr. Chairman: You're strictly out of order.

An hon. member: He's back in order now.

Mr. Shulman: You said you would accept the ruling of the chairman.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have not been ruled out of order.

Mr. Chairman: I thought you were a member of this Legislature here. You are out of order. You will have the opportunity at a later date of making this speech, I am quite sure, and at the present time let us stick to the estimates.

Mr. Bullbrook: This type of land transfer tax, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: —epitomizes exactly what Mr. Galbraith was saying. He is saying in effect that there is no jurisdiction in the democratic world that epitomizes exactly what he is saying more than the government of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: I've not been ruled out of order yet.

Mr. Chairman: Yes you have. I have ruled you out of order.

Mr. W. Newman: You have so. He ruled—

Mr. Bullbrook: And if the member for High Park wants to have some difficult—I haven't been ruled.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Have you ruled me out of order? I am talking about the Land Transfer Tax Act right now. Are you ruling me out of order?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I've ruled you out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am now talking about the Land Transfer Tax Act. This type of direct burden upon the people who can least afford it is exemplary of what Mr. Galbraith was talking about—the absolute fusion of senior technocrats with huge corporations, to the detriment of the people of Ontario and basically the people of Canada.

They will not permit this much longer. The answer does not lie in socialism. It lies in the fact that there must be equity and justice. You cannot permit an elevation of profits to the Canada Trust Co. of 101 per cent in one year—

Mr. Chairman: Now you are out of order again.

Mr. Bullbrook: —of 101 per cent in one year—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Oh come on, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bullbrook: —and at the same time burden the people who can least afford it with that type of land transfer tax.

Mr. MacBeth: Have you read the Act?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is essentially what I want to convey. I want to convey that to you with as much—

An hon. member: Conviction?

An hon. member: Vigor?

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Leadership campaign all over again?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to convey to you as best I can that I, as one member of the Legislature, feel that what is happening here in the Province of Ontario is epitomized by the elevation of the Land Transfer Tax Act. We have embarked upon a programme of seeking revenues into the coffers for undertaking good and worthwhile and sometimes not worthwhile public programmes by taxing those people who can least afford it.

I see in the not too distant future people like Mr. Galbraith and people who would follow his bent in the Province of Ontario, who will not permit that. They will say to themselves—when they look at that type of polarization, when they look at a young family attempting to acquire a home and faced with that type of increased direct tax which they can least afford—that they will not permit the continuation of this type of licence for chartered banks, for life insurance companies, for trust companies, for those people who basically produce nothing for the nation and for the province except the circulation of wealth.

There is nothing socialistic about that.

Mr. Lewis: No, there certainly isn't.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, there isn't. Nothing socialistic about that at all.

Mr. Lewis: The redistribution of wealth is socialism.

Mr. Bullbrook: All we are saying in effect is that on balance I, as one member of the Legislature, want to rise and say I find this type of revenue-producing by this minister completely reprehensible, when he and his colleagues, his Premier, his policy ministers—

Mr. Roy: Darcy baby.

Mr. Bullbrook: —are not prepared to come to this House and talk about this. This is nothing new. It seems that there is a great rise here in the House. I spoke about this very thing four years ago.

Mr. Chairman: Now you are getting out of order again.

Mr. Bullbrook: I spoke about this thing four years ago.

Mr. Chairman: Stick to the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Mr. Bullbrook: If I am going to be called to task on every phrase and sentence as being out of order then I am beginning to regard myself as unduly burdened, really, by the chairman, I must say.

Mr. Lewis: You have not granted any flexibility to this member at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: I thought I had a happy relationship with the chairman and other members of the House. There's a valid point to be made here.

Mr. Lewis: And it has been made.

Mr. Bullbrook: And it is made with great relevance to this particular tax.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: And I close in saying this: As long as I sit in any seat of the 116 that are available to me—well, I don't think I could be the Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Oh you could. You have the talent.

Mr. Bullbrook: —of the 116 which are available to me—

An hon. member: You should be the chairman tonight.

Mr. Lewis: How would you handle a situation like this if you were Speaker?

Mr. Bullbrook: I think I would rule it out of order—I'm not sure.

But I want to say this to you if I might, Mr. Chairman, in closing. This is the important feature. It is not a question of the collection of this tax. You see this minister is no lout.

Mr. Singer: He only looks like one.

Mr. Bullbrook: He's not ignorant; there is only a semblance of that from time to time. The fact of the matter is that he is really nothing more than a tax collector. King John used to send them out on horseback and they would whip the peasants in front of them.

Mr. Deans: He's like the one-humped camel.

Mr. Bullbrook: Now, I suppose the land transfer tax hasn't carved that many incisions in my own constituency, but it's caused them fiscal burdens that I'm not prepared to permit without rising on my part to talk about it. That's the point that I wanted to make, out of order, in order, or beside order, I've made it.

I am very pleased I have, because it's time that somebody continued this discussion of where we are going and whom we are going to continue to burden with taxes.

You see, Canada Trust is very important; very important. And it's lovely to think that in the growth of the nation and the province that they elevate 101 per cent. That's beautiful. I'm all for an accelerated economy. I hope that every constituent of mine has a job. And I hope the trade unions, in their vigour, deliver to him his just wage.

But I want to see some equities for the people who have to pay, because I've got too many people back in Sarnia who can ill-afford it, who have been scraping the bottom of the barrel to acquire the 10 and 20 per cent down payment for houses. When they come in to me, they can't afford the elevation of that type of tax.

I see Royal Trust and Canada Trust and these other companies exacting from the public purse, in effect, through rates of up to 10 per cent—10 per cent guaranteed; 9½ NHA—When across the river, in Port Huron, they are buying their money at 5¾ per cent. Is there something wrong? You bet your life there is something wrong. There is something very wrong when those vested interests are prepared to direct that type of usury to the people of Ontario. There is something very wrong. When a person who buys a house for $30,000, pays $103,000 for that house over a 25-year amortization.

Mr. Lewis: You know he is terrifying the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. Bullbrook: You and some of those people down in Ottawa are the authors of that misadventure on the part of those young people who are trying to get ahead, raise a family, buy a home, and deliver themselves to the welfare of this province.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 802 carried?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a word if I may. I'm not going to comment on the remarks of the preceding speaker. I wish to speak about your conduct, sir. You have a responsibility to keep order in this House. When you rule someone out of order and then allow him to continue as you have done, you make us lose all respect for the Chair.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: There are other people listening here besides the drunken members who have come here tonight; and I would like to suggest to you, sir—

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you sit down!

Mr. Shulman: —that when you make a ruling that someone is out of order, and then allow them to continue and make a laughing-stock of this House, you are putting all of us in disrespect.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I really find this unduly unfair to me. I have tried to articulate a proposition that I feel deeply about. I'm not activated in that by peanuts and otherwise; believe me. Since early this afternoon I've

had these figures prepared that I wanted to deliver. Surely to goodness the member for High Park must recognize that I was making a very serious and focal point about the fiscal policies of this government.

Mr. Shulman: It is completely irrelevant and you should have known to withdraw.

Mr. Roy: That is no reason to call him a drunkard.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I say this to you?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I say this to you, that is indeed unfortunate. I don't require withdrawal because it is obvious that my conduct doesn't require withdrawal. I'm speaking to the point of order. Now, please, would you permit me to speak to that?

Mr. Shulman: There was no point of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: Then why did you rise?

Mr. Shulman: If you had been listening you would have heard.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I say this to you. I want to convey to the member for High Park that I intended to make this speech in connection with the land transfer tax. I think there was a point to be made in pointing out the full polarization of the position of this government, and other governments in Canada, in connection with land transfer tax; its burden upon people—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: —and the burden—

Mr. Shulman: The Treasurer's ministry; that is where it belongs.

Mr. Bullbrook: —of the other tax benefits that are available to corporations. You say, in effect, that this isn't relevant. The fact of the matter is that if you had been in the House his afternoon, you would have recognized that much of this type of discussion, peripherally, has to deal with policy. It can't deal otherwise, because if you constrain yourself totally to the estimates of the Minister of Revenue, then you only talk about the money that he is expending, the money that—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia is out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am just going to say that—

Mr. Chairman: You have been out of order all evening, as a matter of fact. You should know better.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to continue this.—The money that he is expending to collect money in Ontario. That is basically it.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 802 carried?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: A point of order. All right what is your point of order?

Mr. Sargent: My point of order is this, that this member for High Park previously was the cause of a very serious thing in this House, when he called a cabinet minister the same as he remarked tonight. The man left the House. It ruined his career—because of the viciousness of this man. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this man, who has not the decency to label every member of this House with his remarks, should be decent enough to withdraw the remark, if he is any kind of a man. I would ask the chairman to ask him to withdraw the remark.

Mr. Chairman: No, I don't consider that any point of order. I am sorry. Vote 802 carried?

Vote 802 agreed to.

On vote 803:

Mr. Chairman: On vote 803? The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: On the matter of vote 803, Mr. Chairman, can we deal with all matters of assessment under this vote, or do we have to stick to one, two, three and four? I think the matter of assessment could be best dealt with—

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I think we can handle the whole four items. The minister agreed. We can deal with the four.

Mr. Good: Thank you. First I would like to make a few remarks and tell the minister what my feelings are—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the member would forgive me for interrupting at this stage. There were one or two comments I thought I might make just at the beginning. It will take about three minutes.

Mr. Good: All right, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the assessment division on April 1, the assessment division of the former Department of Municipal Affairs, became the municipal assessment division of my ministry. The division has undergone an extensive reorganization. The office of the executive director has been enlarged to include an assessment policy section, and a staff member to maintain contact between the government and the municipalities. A new office of senior director of field services has been established. The number of area directors has been reduced from seven to four, and the assessment education branch has been amalgamated with the assessment standards branch.

I am deliberately doing this, Mr. Chairman, because I think it may have some effect on some of the comments the hon. member may wish to make.

The streamlining of the division was a wise and beneficial move on the part of the former Minister of Municipal Affairs and the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Bales) at a time when the division was faced with a gigantic task of reassessing all real property throughout the province. I think he is to be complimented on his foresight. The revaluation of property on a provincial scale is proceeding on schedule. With assessment to be based on current market value, it is our goal that taxes will be kept at a level that will not place an undue burden on the individual taxpayer.

Another major duty of the municipal assessment division is to take the annual census of the municipalities, and to record the names of those persons eligible to vote in municipal elections and to serve as jurors.

As hon. members are aware, a bill now before the House proposes a new system that would make enumeration more accurate, more current and a more useful tool in the execution of a variety of government programmes. Because of the technical nature of some of the programmes of the revenue division, and the municipal assessment division, it is our intention to proceed with a programme designed to keep our citizens well informed of our methods and procedures, and of how these will affect the general public.

Whether it be the collection of provincial revenue, or municipal assessment, or any other aspect of my ministry, we intend as far as possible to involve all of those who are vitally concerned, including the business and professional communities and the general public.

Thanks for your consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a few remarks regarding some of the matters that the minister has raised at this time. Briefly, they are these. First of all we must consider that the assessment function was taken over by the province from the municipalities a few years ago. At that time the reason given was that everything was to be brought around to an equitable basis.

Now we find, Mr. Chairman, that the assessment department feels it doesn't want the whole assessment function that had been done very well by many of the municipalities and not as well by some of the other small municipalities. We find that in future the assessment department, which is run by the province, will deal only with actual valuation of property across the province.

The enumeration function, as mentioned by the minister, will still be done by the assessment department, but will be turned over to the municipal clerk; and it will be his responsibility to keep it up to date.

Now this, I presume, will, of course, require various amendments to the Assessment Act, probably the Municipal Act and, of course, the school Acts, including the Separate School Administration Act, the Secondary School Administration Act and the School Administration Act.

We find then that the bothersome job of keeping the assessment role—relating to school support, residences, addresses and enumerations—will now be the responsibility of the municipal clerk. The municipalities are going to have to hire back much more staff than they presently now employ to look after this particular job, which is going to be exclusively their responsibility from the time of one enumeration to another enumeration.

The new Municipal Assessment Act shows that this enumeration will be done in the fall prior to the election, which will be held every two years. So far we have nothing in writing to show us that the assessment department will be doing an annual enumeration, which should facilitate it to some extent.

Then, I am greatly concerned how and what process will be used to keep the enumeration records held by the clerk up to date; especially as it relates to school support. Previously, there were procedures to follow if there was a mistake in an assessment notice that came to a tenant. Tenants did receive assessment notices before from the assessment department. He was listed as a public shool supporter when he wanted to support a separate school, or vice versa. He had to file his notice with the municipal assessment office, or with the regional assessment office. If it was not corrected in time, he would have to appear before the assessment review clerk.

This will now be the responsibility of the municipal clerk and the municipal clerk is going to have to act as assessment review officer when it comes to matters of school support, changes in the enumeration and misspellings; and, I presume, incorrect addresses and incorrect names. So now we can see a buildup of more staff back in the municipal office, which the department had taken away a few years ago when they took over the function of assessment.

Well, I think the complete estimate here is $31 million, which represents roughly $4 per capita for the assessment function across the province being done by the provincial government. In my own municipality the per capita cost of assessment—and, Mr. Chairman, I don't hesitate to state that we had a very good assessment function in the city of Waterloo—the cost to the municipality was somewhere between $1.80 and $2.25 per capita. So here we find that the cost of reassessment by the provincial government is considerably greater than it was when the municipality did it. But now the department has decided that it just wants to look after the professional aspects of assessment—that is, the evaluation of houses—and will turn back all this bothersome, expensive and day-to-day upkeeping of the enumeration rolls to the municipalities and let them fuss and fight with this, and let them bear the expense of doing it.

I am rather concerned about the problems that are going to arise in this transitional period. I think school boards have had considerable difficulty up to now getting data from regional assessment offices. The Treasurer of the province said months ago that data processing tapes of the assessment records would not be supplied to school boards without cost. Other information which was wanted by municipalities in many instances was a long time coming; property transfers were running anywhere up to six months behind; municipalities could not get out their tax notices, and all these problems had arisen.

I suggest that these problems are nothing to the problems which are going to arise when half of the function is being returned to the municipality, because the municipality does not, at this time, have the staff to handle these new problems which are now being thrust upon it.

The minister made mention in his remarks a few moments ago that market value assessment was going to result in keeping taxes, I believe, on an even and equitable basis. Well, Mr. Chairman, no one can predict what market value assessment is going to mean across the province.

Mr. Deacon: They have a good idea in York.

Mr. Good: In 1974, when we get our new assessment basis for taxation in 1975, the whole appeal process will be rendered useless that first year, because no one will be able to tell from his new assessment what his taxes are going to be until after the mill rate is struck.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I suggest to the hon. member that I didn't say that—

Mr. Good: Would you repeat that sentence please?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —with assessment to be based on current market value? It is our goal that taxes will be kept at a level—

Mr. Good: Oh.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —that will not place an undue burden on the individual taxpayer. Of course, it can only be the goal. Nobody really can tell exactly what will happen in that period, but—

Mr. Good: It is your goal that taxes will be kept on a reasonable level for all people. A very high-sounding and fancy phrase, Mr. Chairman. But let me assure the minister that the problems of market value assessments that have been done are great. The director of assessment for the Province of Ontario made a statement I believe a year ago to the effect that there is no evidence that shifts have occurred after market value assessment has taken place.

Mr. Chairman, I think that a detailed and proper analysis of what has happened in

many municipalities will show that there is indeed much evidence of shifts from commercial and industrial assessment to residential assessment after market value.

We have been all through this before for the benefit of the two previous ministers who have had assessment under their jurisdiction, and I don't want, this evening, to go into all the detailed and documented evidence of municipalities where shifts have taken place. Let me just refer the minister to the fact that members of the county council of Waterloo have done a very detailed study regarding the shifts of market value assessments that have occurred, and the greater burden which has been placed on residential property because of these shifts.

They are presently going to meet with the provincial Treasurer, and I presume the Minister of Revenue, who has assessment under his aegis at the present time, to try to figure out what can be done about these shifts. My understanding was that studies were being made in certain parts of Halton and Peel counties regarding the shift of assessment which occurred there, and it was most dramatic in that county when we look at the decrease in assessment of some of the large industrial and oil companies compared to the tremendous increase in assessment and tax burden which resulted in the residential property in Peel and Halton counties.

The things which I think presently must be looked at between now and the time that we do get on the market value assessment, is the completion of certain studies that were promised by the provincial Treasurer when he was Minister of Municipal Affairs several years ago. He promised that the matter of taxation on cottage properties would be looked into, he promised that the matter of farm assessment would be dealt with on a more equitable basis.

I believe the government has made the statement that the present 25 per cent Farm Tax Reduction Act is nothing more than an interim measure and a more equitable basis will be worked out in the future. Well, this is now going into its third year of rebate, and I think it is high time that a better system of dealing with fair taxation for farm property be worked out.

I don't consider the 25 per cent farm tax reduction rebate as a fair system. There are people getting the rebate who have never grown five cents worth of agricultural products on their property; there are people living outside of municipalities who can build a $100,000 home on 25 acres of land and get a farm tax reduction for their whole tax bill. Some farmers, of course, perhaps should be getting more than that, depending on the rate of their assessment. But I think farm assessment is a very important matter which still has not been properly resolved.

The matter of assessment on cottage properties I think has to relate itself to the fairness of taxation for educational purposes on recreational property. Perhaps there is no classification of property in the province which will show such a drastic increase when we relate it to market value as will cottage or lakeshore properties. No property has increased, perhaps with the exception of highly urban centres, as much in value, related to market value, as has lakeshore property in the last few years, with the result that I think we will find a tremendous tax burden on all property in recreational areas.

The previous Minister of Municipal Affairs, now the provincial Treasurer, had promised some time ago that the whole matter of education tax on cottage property would be looked into. I would like to ask the minister what studies are going on in that regard.

The committee that was set up regarding the assessment of golf courses and golf course property has reported to the minister. The matter of fixed assessment has created problems in some areas where municipalities would not allow a fixed assessment for golf property, with the consequent result that hardships could result from a taxation point of view.

I would like to ask the minister what action the government intends to take regarding the assessment of golf club properties in the light of the report which has now been tabled and put before the Legislature some time ago.

There is one other thing I would like to mention briefly and that is the impact of the legislation that we passed last year, the amendments to the Assessment Act, which dealt with the freezing of assessment from 1970 until 1974. This has turned out exactly as I had predicted at the time. It has been a great financial burden to many municipalities.

My own municipality of Waterloo has lost tens of thousands of dollars of revenue from developers whose property cannot be reclassified as registered plans of subdivisions are put on it because it did not move from a raw agricultural property into a registered

plan of subdivision. This tax burden, of course, has to be spread across the rest of the municipality.

The assessment policies of the government in that bill last year, Bill 127, have now made it possible for speculators to tear down buildings on land and sit there for three years with land which is assessed at a ridiculously low rate in proportion to the total assessment. I am talking here about properties which have not been reassessed previously at market value, but are still under old assessment where land was valued relatively low and the buildings are at a higher rate.

Speculators are sitting on land with the buildings torn off and paying very, very little in the way of property tax to the municipality. They can afford to sit on that land and hold it, with hardly any cost to them, and watch its value rise, and the minute the market value assessment comes off—boom—they'll sell it and make a handsome profit. These are some of the results of amendments that we made to the Assessment Act last year.

One other point before closing that I would like to impress upon the minister is the importance of getting your amendments into the Assessment Act, that relate to the new Municipal Election Act. There are many questions unanswered in that Municipal Election Act and they can only be resolved when we get the amendments to the other related Acts. I would appreciate the minister's comments on some of these points.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What the hon member has referred to today is not a new philosophy he has expounded, he has done this over the last two or three years. I think the whole question is whether he believes in market assessment on the basis of market value, or whether he doesn't. If he believes in the assessment at market value then he, of course, will agree that the province had to do something, that this was the only way to go about it. If he is suggesting that there are in the process some imbalances, I would be the last to disagree with that.

The province knew this was something that had been waiting years, and years, and years, and I don't know if any other government in Canada has done this. I don't know whether any government in North America has done it. But it is obviously a very difficult thing for a government to make up its mind to do politically because of the very fact that there are so many problems inherent, in finally attacking this problem. And this government has attacked the problem, it has done something about it, which most governments, in fact any government I have heard of has been afraid to tackle—to finally do something about the kind of mishmash we have had in assessments across the whole of the province.

There are going to be a lot of problems. Lord knows, I think that I have had to deal with the assessment—officially it came into the Ministry of Revenue on April 1—which means that I have had approximately seven weeks officially, and I would say about 3½ or four weeks actually to take a look at this thing and never, ever in my life, I can honestly say in the period of time that I have been in government, indeed in this Legislature, which is more than a few years, have I seen any problem which I think has contained so many difficulties to resolve.

I'm sure the hon. member knows that, and I am sure that I am going to stand in my place here and be on the hot-seat on many occasions because of the difficulties inherent in the tackling of this very vexatious problem. This government has done it, it intends to see it through. It is a very difficult problem, there will be some imbalances in the process. We will right them as we see them, we will try to anticipate them. Some of the things the hon. member is talking about I just don't agree with. There are some of them I do agree with—and we are going to do whatever we can to resolve them, but you know if we go into all of the details—I can probably think of more problems inherent in this than the hon. member even can. But I don't intend to stand here and explain all of the problems we have had, as I am sure everyone is familiar with them. I have been advised that there are now some 160 municipalities which are under the new market value assessment system, that they are now assessing under it and taxing under it. By and large, there hasn't been a consistent significant shift of assessment and therefore taxation, which is in my view very heartening, considering some of the problems that have been anticipated.

Mr. Deans: There have been inconsistent significant shifts?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There haven't been.

Mr. Deans: You say there have been inconsistent significant shifts—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Consistent significant—

Mr. Deans: The minister says there have been no consistent significant shifts, but there have been inconsistent significant shifts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, of course there are; there are bound to be some shifts. As a matter of fact, the whole purpose of the new policy on assessment market value is to see that there will be shifts, that there will be shifts which will right any injustices.

The hon. members know perfectly well that many properties were not only over-assessed, but many were under-assessed. Indeed I was surprised to find, in what little study I've been able to do on this, that there were so many properties that weren't assessed at all. There were across this province many of them —I forget what the figure is, but it was a very significant figure. Imagine, across this province for many years there were some properties that had never been assessed.

Of course there are shifts. There is a shift in that case, where properties that hadn't been assessed are being assessed and will pay taxes. And of course, as I say, that was the whole thrust of it, that there will be a shift in a direction where there will be more equality and more justice in municipal assessment.

Again, I don't want to back into the position where I'm saying I don't deal with policy on this thing, because in fact I do deal with policy insofar as municipal assessment itself is concerned. But there are some aspects the hon. member mentioned in which I don't deal with it.

Mr. Sargent: God help us if you give us a policy of assessment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He talked about the tapes that haven't been made available to municipalities. I am advised that, indeed, the tapes are given to the municipalities free, but they themselves have to process them.

Mr. Good: I didn't say that. I said schools.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the municipalities are the ones, I am told. The school boards go to the municipalities and get the tapes from them; presumably the municipalities then charge the school boards for the processing of the tapes, which can be quite a costly process if it's done right across the province.

Obviously, if the ministry is going to do this free of charge, there will be many school boards and many areas that are going to ask for these processed tapes, because it doesn't cost them anything, even though they don't really require them. And if there are any injustices in this particular area, we're prepared to look into the situations.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, one further question: The minister talks about the policy of assessment, but the minister must surely realize that the policy developed by him and his department, as it relates to the Assessment Act and the assessment function, will have direct bearing on taxation policy.

Let me cite an example: Your Assessment Act now says that all property must be assessed at market value. But the Municipal Act says all property must be taxed on 100 per cent of assessment. So we have full taxation on full market value assessment.

Up to now, where you've done your market value assessment, have your studies convinced you or indicated that perhaps there's going to have to be some adjustment made; that, in the final analysis, various types of property may have to be taxed at different rates in relation to their full market value?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If there is some evidence of that, of course there will have to be adjustments.

Mr. Good: Did you say there is some evidence, or if there is?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said that we will have to consider making some adjustments. Of course, it would be overly optimistic to presume we can proceed with this without finding out that it won't work that simply in some instances. Some adjustments are going to have to be made in some cases. That is, if we find it just doesn't work that way in a particular instance, then we will have to attempt to make whatever adjustments are going to be necessary.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the first thing I wanted to ask is the minister's view on the resolution that I have in the private members' notices of motion, where I'm suggesting that municipalities, upon adoption of market value assessment, be given the right to apply a factor to the assessment by class—that is, industrial, commercial, residential or agriculture—to enable them to restore the traditional balance of taxation as between classes.

The point of this is that when market value assessment was introduced in the county of York in 1969 there was a major shift in the tax burden from industry onto residential taxpayers. The reason for this is that for many years industry had become accustomed to bearing a higher share of taxes—because the assessment of industry was at a higher percentage or proportion of market value than

it was on the homeowners. But industry was accustomed to bearing that share and was quite happy to do so. Actually it had the great advantage of being able to deduct municipal taxes before calculation of income tax. So it was less of a burden on the corporate taxpayer than it was on the private individual.

If a factor could be applied which was subject to OMB approval so that there would be an appeal tribunal that industry could go to in case they felt the factor applied was an unfair one, which would restore the traditional balance of tax burden as between the industrial taxpayers, the residential taxpayers and the agricultural taxpayers, then we would be able to avoid this very serious problem that faces people when market value assessment is introduced.

I think that the concept of market value assessment in general is a good concept. It means that we can come to a value that we understand—it is the selling price of our home that we are prepared to sell for, or roughly in that order. If we are allowed to bring this factor in, then we can avoid this very burdensome increase in taxes. In some instances it caused increases of 100 per cent or more in the tax bills of the individual as a result of market value assessment.

A lot of that increase wasn't due just to the fact that industry was relieved of taxes. It was also due to the fact that some people had been getting a break for many years. But regardless of that, let's remember that for years industry has been accustomed in a municipality to taking on a certain burden of the total tax bill. When market value assessment comes in, I think it is important that they continue to carry the same proportion of the burden.

I would appreciate the minister's comments on that suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, actually what the hon. member is saying is that we should change the assessment system which we have embarked upon—

Mr. Deacon: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because he is suggesting that the municipalities shall be able to make some changes in the factors which go into the assessment.

Mr. Deacon: No, I am sorry. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out I am not talking about a change in the assessment system. I am talking about a change in the taxation system. Assessment is a matter of deciding what is the proper burden as between people in similar houses, similar plants, similar stores. But what I am talking about is a matter of a system of taxation as between classes. It is the same as we recommended—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I understand what the hon. member is referring to and I hate, as I say, to fall back on what we consider is an excuse for not giving an answer to it. But actually what he is talking about is a tax policy for municipalities. The Ministry of Revenue is charged with carrying out assessment on the policy as established by the government. If he wants to talk about the new kind of tax policies of the municipalities, I am afraid I am going to have to refer him to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs who deals with this under tax policy.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I have two other points. The first one is a question of—

Mr. Chairman: We are not going to finish this tonight. It could be discussed at the next time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday we will return to consideration of the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue. I understand that the estimates of Community and Social Services may conclude in the standing committee, in which case the Ministry of Labour would proceed in that standing committee.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment motion is put, could the House leader advise us if it is his intention not to proceed with any legislation until next week?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think that I have informed both of my opposite numbers that immediately we have the continuing legislative programme to place before them—hopefully it will be sometime tomorrow, not

later than Thursday morning—we will then know when we can call the further legislative programme.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if I may pursue this just a bit further. The minister and I had a chat earlier today on this subject and while he did say something about tomorrow, the House doesn't sit tomorrow. It is of some significance that we should know either that you are going to get into legislation later this week or perhaps not until next week.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think to be fair with the hon. member I should say to him that we probably will not consider legislation in the balance of this week.

Mr. Singer: All right.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Estimates, Ministry of Revenue, Mr. Grossman, continued 3293

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 3326

No. 84

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are students from Vanier Public School of Lively and from Blantyre Public School of Scarborough. In the west gallery there are students from Thessalon Senior Public School of Thessalon and Stittsville Union Public School of Stittsville. A little later in the afternoon, in the east gallery, we will have students from Amherstburg Public School of Amherstburg and Holy Family Separate School of Sault Ste. Marie; in the east gallery also, students from Eitz Chaim Private School of Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

AMENDMENTS TO THE POLICE ACT

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, later this afternoon I shall be introducing a bill containing several far-reaching amendments to the Police Act, which are designed to streamline the province's system of police bargaining and arbitration.

The police have traditionally been viewed as a group apart, one with special responsibilities vital to all of us. And this principle has been recognized by the inclusion of police bargaining and arbitration procedures in the Police Act, as distinct from the province's general labour legislation.

It is our intention with this bill to continue this practice and, in doing so, acknowledge the importance of also developing and maintaining harmonious and effective labour relations in this field.

In an effort to develop a system that would be fully representative of the needs of police governing bodies, members of the police forces and the public, the Ministry of the Solicitor General has worked closely with the Police Association of Ontario, the Association of Municipal Police Governing Authorities, the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police and the Ontario Municipal Liaison Committee. And I should like to acknowledge the co-operation of all of these groups in developing this particular bill, in an ongoing search for major reforms in their own specific labour-management relations process.

The amendments are designed to resolve several issues that exist in the current process and structure.

One of the principal concerns for all of the parties involved has been the frequent delays in bargaining and arbitration procedures due to a number of factors, including time limits and suitable and available arbitrators. At best, choosing arbitrators has been on an ad hoc basis, an uncertain situation.

Under current legislation, the system for reaching agreement between parties is divided into only two stages—bargaining and, failing agreement, arbitration. There has been no provision for conciliation and the result has been undue emphasis on binding arbitration.

In addition, there appears to be only limited jurisprudence in this field and no central pool of information.

There is also the question of the role of municipal councils in the process. Although bound by the financial consequences of a contract agreement or an award, municipal councils have no direct role in, or access to, the bargaining or arbitration process. The amendments, designed to tackle these problem areas, are as follows:

The principal recommendation in this Act is the establishment of the Ontario police arbitration commission within the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

The arbitration commission will oversee a full-time arbitrator as well as develop and maintain a register of readily available and qualified part-time arbitrators designated by the Solicitor General.

The commission will also lend administrative and technical assistance to arbitrators, sponsor research programmes relating to arbitration processes and awards, and sponsor the publication and distribution of information relating to these matters.

The new commission will consist of five members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Two members, other than the chairman, will be representative of police

governing bodies and two others will be representative of members of police forces. In effect, then, the commission provides the parties with an opportunity to participate fully in the evaluation and direction of this new system of arbitration.

The full-time arbitrator on the staff of the commission will be appointed by the Solicitor General on the recommendation of the commission. The appointment of this full-time arbitrator is intended to limit the delays that can be caused by the lack of available and acceptable arbitrators.

As many arbitrations as possible will be referred to the full-time arbitrator and the remainder will be delegated to part-time arbitrations.

This basic change, Mr. Speaker, which has the support of the parties, is a move away from the current system of using three-man boards of arbitration. For the system will have a single arbitrator for each arbitration and it will be the Solicitor General's responsibility to designate arbitrators in specific arbitrations.

We had originally considered providing the arbitration service under the umbrella of the Ontario labour management arbitration commission in the Ministry of Labour. However, it was the feeling of the parties, and I agree, that as a matter of principle, the adjudication of police contract disputes should be kept separate from the machinery that is used for general industrial disputes.

It is our intention, nevertheless, to develop a close working relationship between the two commissions to ensure the fullest utilization of staff and resources.

In order to speed up the bargaining process, the new Act allows for the commencement of bargaining 90 days prior to the expiry date of an existing agreement. In addition, the Act requires bargaining to begin within 15 days of a request to bargain, instead of the 60 days currently stipulated. This, we feel, will do much to overcome some of the delays in getting bargaining under way before contracts have actually expired.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, conciliations have heretofore not been available under the present system to parties attempting to negotiate an agreement.

As an experiment, we are proposing to make this service available and to encourage the parties to use conciliation where either party feels it might assist them in reaching a voluntary agreement.

Currently, the Police Act provides that boards of police commissioners must bargain. This has been interpreted to mean that an entire board must bargain and has been cited as another cause of delay because, frequently, it was difficult to draw together all the members at one time. The new Act permits a board to designate one or more of its members as a bargaining committee to bargain on its behalf.

The bill also provides municipal councils with direct access to the arbitration process. Earlier, I referred to municipal councils having to accept the financial consequences of an award, despite the fact they had no direct access to the process. The new Act provides that, where a board of police commissioners exists, municipal councils can make direct representations to the arbitrator.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, these amendments are designed to produce a more workable and responsive system of police bargaining and arbitration procedures. There were other changes suggested by the parties which we have not incorporated in this legislation, because we feel that some of them should be considered in the broader context of police organization and administration, which will be examined by the task force on policing which I announced earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these amendments represent a major step forward in the collective bargaining process for this vitally important sector of public service.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

BRANT AREA LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform you and the members of the House that I have commissioned a review of local government to take place in the Brant county area. This study is the result of a joint request received from the city of Brantford and the county of Brant which my ministry has been considering.

A joint liaison committee with representation from the city and the county has been formed and it has helped to draft and approve the terms of reference for the study. The terms of reference for the Brant area local government review are:

(1) The Brant area shall include, primarily, the municipalities of the county of Brant and the city of Brantford.

(2) The commissioner will examine the following aspects of local government in the Brant area and report his findings and recommendations: (a) structure; (b) organization; (c) financing; (d) intermunicipal relations and problems concerning two or more municipalities and/or boards and commissions; (e) the future development of the Brant area or other changes that may affect local government; and (f) any other related matter affecting the Brant area, particularly the relevance of the outer boundaries of the area to be studied.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I announce that we have retained Mr. Howard Smith to be the commissioner of the study. Mr. Smith is a native of Preston, Ont., and for 25 years has been associated with the planning firm of Dryden and Smith. During that time, he has done planning work for many of the municipalities in southwestern Ontario and is highly regarded by them. He is a past director of the town planning institute of Canada.

All of the municipalities surrounding Brant county have received an intensive study of one kind or another. From this study by Mr. Smith, we will know more about the interrelationships and problems of the municipalities in this part of Ontario. I have asked Mr. Smith to submit his report to me by July, 1973.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

SALE OF FORMER MERCER REFORMATORY PROPERTY

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that a few weeks ago the site of the former Mercer Reformatory was advertised for sale since it had become surplus to the needs of the government. The advertised date of tender closing was May 10. On that date I was advised by representatives of the city of Toronto that the city was interested in the property and wished to have the opportunity of submitting a tender.

I wish to advise hon. members that yesterday I received a copy of city of Toronto by-law No. 131-72, enacted that day, adopting the recommendation of an executive committee report to purchase the Mercer Reformatory site for the sum of $1,430,001. this being $1 higher than the amount of the highest tender that had been received previously. The city proposes to use the land for parks and recreational purposes.

Although the bid of the city of Toronto was received after the advertised closing date and is therefore somewhat informal, I believe that special consideration should be given to it because of the public use to be made of the land under the city's proposal. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, after consulting with my colleagues, I have decided to accept the bid of the city of Toronto and to proceed with all dispatch to complete the transaction.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

SENIOR CITIZENS' WEEK

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that the third week of June, beginning on the 18th, will be recognized as Ontario Senior Citizens' Week, with the theme "Living Is Ageless."

Senior citizens of this province and the all-party select committee on ageing, ably chaired by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers), were all influential in initiating our first official province-wide Senior Citizens' Week last year, and they were a most successful seven days. To date, our communications with senior citizens' groups and communities indicate that this year's events will be even more successful and widespread throughout the province.

While this will be a time to emphasize our respect for our citizens in retirement, it will also be a time to emphasize the need to change our attitudes towards the process of ageing. Most people know very little about the ageing process as it exists today. Our attitudes have not kept pace with medical achievements which have prolonged physical life. Many people do not know how to cope with 10, 15 or 20 years of leisure time.

We want to prove to people that living is ageless; that there is no limit to a person's capacity to enjoy life to the fullest; that the human imagination knows no time barriers. Thus, Ontario's Senior Citizens' Week is designed to emphasize that junior citizens need senior citizens, that pensioners are a great source of talent, experience and wisdom which can be most helpful to businessmen, families and children.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we wish to emphasize that in order to prepare for years of leisure activity in retirement it is essential that working men and women prepare for

their retirement 10 or 15 years prior to the actual day they receive their first pension cheque. Many senior citizens who worked for many years to achieve a good life in retirement are now working even harder to help us learn how to truly enjoy life and how to live.

The good work achieved by these older people benefits the entire community and we want people made aware of this fact. I will be meeting with residents' councils from our homes for the aged and elderly persons' centres and with senior citizens from clubs, housing projects and communities in Niagara Falls, Ottawa, Toronto and Kapuskasing in that week.

We will also have a special Senior Citizens' Day at Ontario Place on June 20, 1972. I invite all the members from Metro Toronto, York, Peel and Ontario counties to let their constituents know, and I invite you all to attend Senior Citizens' Week celebrations in your own communities and Senior Citizens' Day at Ontario Place.

While staff from the ministry is able to offer ideas to stimulate the planning, the actual implementation of events for Senior Citizens' Week is being carried out by concerned people in the communities we all represent. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am asking for your support in our second annual Ontario Senior Citizens' Week, June 18 to 24, 1972, and your assistance in making it a truly meaningful seven days.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT STUDY ON CHATHAM-KENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Treasurer if he is making any plans to inaugurate a regional government study on Chatham-Kent?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think I can assure the hon. member that when I have a request to do so from the county of Kent and the city of Chatham, I will do so with great dispatch.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: As per that dispatch, why is it that the first study for Brant county was promised when this minister was Minister of Municipal Affairs some years ago, and he wasn't able to inaugurate it with any dispatch, since he just announced it today?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): He couldn't get the approval of the local member!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We had limited resources, I am told, and they were really saving it in case Chatham and Kent asked.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, now that we have got that settled it seems the dispatch is sometimes a little undispatched.

Interjection by an hon. member.

PURCHASING PRACTICES OF DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Premier. Has he asked the Attorney General to carry on a collateral and parallel investigation into the purchasing practices of the Department of Municipal Affairs?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the Premier not feel that some of the recent allegations should perhaps be examined by those people in the Department of the Attorney General, because they seem to be somewhat outside the ambit of simply an examination into audit procedures?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am just going by press reports from the public accounts committee, and certainly I think until the public accounts committee has completed its hearings and until it files its report with this Legislature that at this point at least we are not contemplating anything further.

VANNINI REPORT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Premier.

Although the Vannini report is now just two or three days old, since it was well received by spokesmen for the government, have any orders been given or any directions been given to look into the implementation of some of the recommendations, particularly those pertaining to crowd control and special facilities in personnel, for major metropolitan police forces?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think this question might be appropriately directed to the Provincial Secretary for Justice or to the Solicitor General, but in general terms I believe the Ontario Police Commission is look-

ing at this. As to whether any specific directions have gone out as yet, I can't comment, but I think the Leader of the Opposition might inquire of the Solicitor General or the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the question to the Solicitor General, since the major recommendations did involve the police forces that come under his responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, upon receipt of the report, it was referred to the chairman of the Ontario Police Commission for a review in the light of what is in effect at the provincial and local levels and to see what further implementations there should be.

STRIKE AT KITCHENER PLANT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Labour pertaining to the violence in the picket line in the Dare strike in Kitchener. Has he made any recommendations, or has he recommendations to make, that might lower the volatility of that particular labour situation? Is he going to take certain steps to improve the situation so that negotiations might be reinstituted before some serious damage takes place?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact a meeting has been arranged for tomorrow between our senior officials and representatives of both sides. Perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be interested to know that the assistance of the conciliation and mediation branch of our ministry resulted in the signing of a memorandum of agreement. However, it was turned down by the union membership and the meeting tomorrow is designed to solve the outstanding differences.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Has the minister asked the management to dispense with the services of Canadian Driver Pool pending this meeting tomorrow, so that we will not have a recurrence today and tonight of some of the events that have happened over the last two days?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Why don't you deal with them properly?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, what I've read in the paper is that management has said that there would be no shipment of material from the plant.

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the minister outlaw this organization, which is causing so much trouble?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have any further questions?

The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Deans: It is disrupting labour relations in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth does not have the floor!

INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE-BREAKING FIRM

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Perhaps in the field to which the member for Wentworth is addressing himself, could I ask the Attorney General, what is the state of the provincial investigations into the activities of Canadian Driver Pool Ltd?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Those investigations have been undertaken by various forces within the government, and they are confidential until they are complete.

Mr. Lewis: Well, by way of supplementary, just how long is it going to take? It is now more than a year, I think, since the investigations into Canadian Driver Pool have been undertaken by at least three government departments—well, in last year's Labour estimates. May I ask the minister when he thinks they will be concluded, and is there nothing the government can do in the interim to prevent this one company from destroying labour relations in so many areas of the province?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That's what the government wants!

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it has been that length of time.

Mr. Lewis: It has been very close to it—many months.

Mr. Deans: Close to it.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It may be quite some time, but it has not been that long. There have been cases before the courts; consequently those matters were held in abeyance until they were over.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, surely the minister recognizes

that the matter of the wiretap before the courts, in which there was a conviction, does not affect the question of the behaviour of the company Canadian Driver Pool Ltd. or its related associate or subsidiary companies? When will the investigation be completed? What is the problem?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I can't say at the moment when it will be completed, but I know it will be done thoroughly.

STRIKE AT DUNNVILLE PLANT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour. What is the result of the discussions that have been held today into the Lanark Manufacturing Co. situation in Dunnville?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Both Mr. Scott, our director of the conciliation and mediation services, and Mr. Stevens are meeting today with the international vice-president, the union officials and the mayor of Dunnville. The meeting started at 2 o'clock. I haven't heard from them.

Mr. Lewis: By way of one further supplementary: Is the minister clear in his own mind whether or not the company was bluffing in its stated intention to close the plant?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I would express here a personal opinion, I suppose, but from the fact that both the union representatives and our officials from the branch have suggested or advised the membership to accept the contract offer, I would think perhaps the company wasn't bluffing.

Mr. Lewis: Wasn't?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Wasn't.

Mr. Lewis: Do you believe the possibility of the close-down is real?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: We hope not and that is the reason for the meeting that is taking place today.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, if I may. Has the Premier ascertained the information he intended to seek as to the state of inquiries by Mr. Tovell into alternative sites for the Canada Cement Co. at Sand Banks?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this information. The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) is, I believe, away for the day. He will be back tomorrow, and I hope to have that information for the hon. member.

TANKER SUNK IN ST. CLAIR RIVER

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of the Environment. Can he give us a report on the state of the tanker Sidney Smith at the mouth of the St. Clair River and the danger of a possible oil spill?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I should mention that the salvage operation is under the direction of the US Coastguard since it is on the American side of the channel. The joint contingency plan which is worked out between Canada and the US is in effect. Our people are in the area as advisers. As of, I think about 1:30 today—I can read the hon. member a Telex from the US Coastguard to a number of agencies:

> THE STERN SECTION OF THE WRECK IS NOW SECURED BY FIVE ANCHORS. THERE WAS LITTLE MOVEMENT OF THE WRECK NOTED LAST NIGHT. IT IS CONSIDERED THAT THE STABILITY IS SATISFACTORY FOR OIL RECOVERY AND THEREFORE FOR AN INITIAL SALVAGE EFFORT. THERE WAS OIL PUMPED OUT DURING THE NIGHT; ABOUT 2,500 GALLONS. IT WAS STOPPED TEMPORARILY DUE TO PROBLEMS WITH DISCHARGE HOSING AND CREW FATIGUE AND LOW VISIBILITY. THERE IS NO REPORTED CHANGE IN THE OIL SPILL SITUATION. ALL EQUIPMENT AND CREWS REMAIN ON IMMEDIATE STANDBY WITH BOOMS DEPLOYED AS BEFORE. AERIAL RECONNAISSANCE THIS MORNING REVEALED NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGE IN THE OIL SITUATION. A LARGE PUMP WAS LOWERED INTO THE TANK AND PUMPING OPERATIONS RESUMED AT 13:30.

I assume that's 12:30 because I think they operate on standard time. They propose to continue removing the oil from the wreck, continue the vessel traffic control and maintain maximum readiness for pollution.

In addition, Captain Bennett of the Canadian Ministry of Transport, is the deputy man in the operation. He has assumed pollution control operations for both sides of the river and a tentative primary recovery site was established on Herson Island in the event of significant oil losses.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Are there any representatives or officials of the Ontario Ministry of the Environment on site or nearby or directly in touch?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There are nearby.

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Auld: They are not out on the tug beside the wreck.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

REORGANIZATION OF WHITBY HOSPITAL

Mr. Lewis: One last question, of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, in the absence of the Minister of Health. Has the Provincial Secretary for Social Development been made aware of the situation in the Whitby Ontario Hospital subsequent to the reorganization of May 1?

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that the Minister of Health has discussed the situation with me briefly, but I have no further information other than the results of that discussion.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) is presently recuperating at home, as you know, and should be in the House before too long.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has further questions? Supplementary?

The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): Could the minister explain the memo from the hospital administrator, M. J. Fisher, to the director of nursing, Mrs. Dona Kidd, re attendance at the 14th annual convention of registered nursing assistants, about Mr. J. McNutt, who was one of the delegation who came to see the minister to protest about the changes in hospital? The memo which clearly conveys—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member must direct his question only, without comments.

Mr. Dukszta: Okay! This memo clearly conveys—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has directed his question, I believe?

Mr. Dukszta: No I haven't, Mr. Speaker. I haven't really come to the major point of the question; which is what the memo states. It is the punitive administrative action. Can I bring this out?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has directed a question already.

Mr. Dukszta: In view of the fact that the memo reads:

> As you know, Mr. McNutt has been reported to have been actively politically oppositional to the reorganization of the hospital, despite the fact that it was well known that the reorganization had been approved not only by me, but by the director of psychiatrical services branch.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, Mr. Speaker, as best as I can take the question directed to me—am I familiar with that memo; and my answer is no.

Mr. Dukszta: May I ask a supplementary of Mr. Minister—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has indicated he is not familiar with it. How can there be a supplementary?

The hon. Minister of Labour has the answer to a previous question.

HIRING OF PREGNANT SCHOOL TEACHERS

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Tuesday of this week the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) asked me a question concerning maternity leave policies by the Wentworth County Separate School Board and the question was as follows:

> **Will the Minister of Labour order an investigation into the report of the Hamilton Spectator as of June 2, that the Wentworth County Separate School Board does not intend to rehire for the fall term on a full-time basis, teachers who are pregnant?**
>
> **Supplementary: Will the minister, in asking the women's bureau to investigate this, also ask them to investigate the possibility that the Wentworth County Board has found a way of getting around the maternity leave clause in the WEEO Act?**

Hon. Mr. Guindon: And the answer, Mr. Speaker, is that no complaints have been received from the two women teachers referred to in the newspaper article.

An investigating officer from the women's bureau has initiated a preliminary inquiry into the policy and practices of both boards. The interim report indicates the folowing:

> The superintendent of education of the Wentworth County Separate School Board reports that, although the maternity leave policy negotiated with the Ontario Teachers' Federation has not as yet been rewritten to accommodate the maternity

leave provision of the WEEO Act, in practice, teachers are given the option of choosing either the minimum statutory leave or the longer leave as negotiated in the agreement.

He further stated that no action has been taken which would change the employment status of pregnant teachers either prior to or after maternity leave.

Insofar as the Wentworth County School Board is concerned the superintendent of academic operations reports that their contract has been changed to comply with the maternity leave provision of the WEEO Act.

Teachers may now choose between the statutory provision or a one year leave of absence. The women's bureau is aware that during the period of adjustment to the new provision misunderstandings can arise. They therefore encourage both employers and employees to approach them for information and technical assistance in establishing their mutual rights and responsibilities re maternity leave.

If an individual woman feels that her right to maternity leave is being violated then she should contact the women's bureau immediately.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister's answer mean that the teachers will be entitled to be rehired on a full-time teaching basis if they are pregnant?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, as I see it in this reply from the women's bureau, that's what I understand.

Mr. Deans: A very nice answer!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

SPADINA RAPID TRANSIT

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Having regard for the sense of urgency that must have prevailed in the minister's mind and in the minds of his colleagues to pass the order in council on Feb. 2, 1972, designating the alignment from Wilson station to Eglinton Ave. as a subway, why is it that nothing has been done to this date to give effect to that order in council to start constructing a subway in so far as it relates to that section?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That's a very good question.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, that order in council was passed for the specific purpose of allowing funds to be transferred to Metro for the purpose of keeping their highly qualified design engineers on staff in order that they might get the design under way for the subway. and in fact this has been started.

In so far as the subway itself is concerned, it is now in the hands of the city of Toronto. We have, of course, been dealing with this matter in the Joint Technical Transportation Planning Committee—

Mr. Singer: The city? Isn't it the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Carton: It is now holding public hearings, and this would appear to be the delay. I would like to see them choose the alignment and get on with the construction of the subway.

Mr. Givens: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The minister knows that the public hearings are completed.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Question!

Mr. Givens: Why doesn't he write them a letter, lean on them, and give them a peremptory period of 30 days to determine the alignment? He should tell them that if they won't do it, we will do it. The minister did this before. Why doesn't he do it now?

Mr. Singer: A good question.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, the present situation is that the hearings have not been completed for that length of time.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): The member is better in opposition than in government.

Hon. Mr. Carton: We still feel that it is Metro's jurisdiction to get on with the building of the subway.

Mr. Singer: The minister left the city for Metro now.

Mr. Givens: Happy, eh?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park is next.

DISTURBANCE AT PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary

for Social Development. It's a three-part question.

What were the circumstances at the Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital on Sunday which resulted in a member of the staff being held as a hostage by the patients? What did the police do to restore order? What steps is he taking to prevent a recurrence?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that I will have to take that question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer, and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs has the answer to a question.

NEW TORONTO AIRPORT

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) asked me the other day—

An hon. member: He is not here. Where is the member for York Centre.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —about the appraisers in the North Pickering community. I believe I replied they were on a per diem basis. He asked about the per diem rate, which I did not know, but I now find that it's $150 a day.

Mr. Martel: Just about the minister's salary, isn't it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview is next.

ANNUAL REPORTS OF POLICE BODIES

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Solicitor General. Since his estimates apparently are now imminent, could he tell us when we are going to have the annual reports of the Ontario Police Commission and the Ontario Provincial Police to enable us to reasonably discuss those estimates?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the reports are going through the mill at the present time. It's a new ministry, and we really haven't come to grips with the concept of a departmental report. I imagine it is somewhere in the works outside.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, would the minister not agree that if that information is not available to us, he should make some arrangements to postpone his estimates until that information is here?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister too can come back then.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the members of the opposition have demonstrated a certain competence in dealing with estimates of the department without having the reports before them.

Mr. Singer: Oh, but we want the up-to-date advice.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We want a reasonable discussion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

WATERLOO REGION AMALGAMATION

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs:

Has it been brought to the minister's attention that a poll taken in the Beverly township-Twelve Mile region, which is proposed to go with Waterloo, showed that 71 of 112 people were in favour of remaining in Beverly and only 28 wished to go with Waterloo county? Does he feel that would influence his decision with regard to the bill?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of that, and I will be glad to have a look at it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre is next.

NEW TORONTO AIRPORT

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Relations.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Affairs.

Mr. Deacon: What?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Affairs—Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Deacon: Affairs—right. Why did the minister not include the report of the Department of Transportation and Communications, dated Nov. 29, 1971, and the Ontario Department of Transport report, dated December, 1970, in the documents regarding the second airport which the minister tabled Tuesday, both of which reports recommended that Malton continue to be the major airport

and that lesser airports be developed at Peter's Corners and North Pickering?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Why, did we not table it?

Mr. Deacon: Why did the Treasurer not include these in the documents?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I felt that we had, but I'll be glad to take a look at those specific reports and see why they weren't included.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Will the Treasurer table them then?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'll take it under consideration.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If he does not table it, would not the minister be guilty of dissembling in this chamber?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If I were, I wouldn't admit it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-West.

Interjections by hon. members.

PROSECUTION UNDER SURVEYS ACT

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Can an individual be prosecuted under section 6(2) of the Surveys Act for obstructing a surveyor in his work, when the company for which the survey is being done, Dome Petroleum in this case, has not had its application for pipeline construction approved by the National Energy Board, and, presumably, is, therefore, not authorized to conduct a survey?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to get out the RSO, read the Act and advise the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

ONTARIO HYDRO-ELECTRIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Since section 8 of the Power Commission Act sets up the Ontario Hydro-Electric Advisory Council, and since this is the only external input into the operation of Hydro and the only chance for public participation in the operation of Hydro, is it true that this advisory council has not met for 15 years?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I haven't the foggiest idea; but in light of the hon. member's deep and consuming interest with respect to the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission, I shall inquire for him and inform him. And, Mr. Speaker, I won't slip it to him very casually, as he asked the member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. Evans) with the respect to the task force report, I shall give it to him here publicly in the House.

Mr. Singer: Ah!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right between the ribs.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Interjections by hon. members.

HYDRO POLLUTION CONTROL REPORT

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: Has the minister received a copy of Ontario Hydro's report that deals with the cleaning up of air pollution, in which it is stated that it is in the public interest because the direct financial benefit to society in health improvement would far outweigh the costs of the pollution control? Has the minister received that copy?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): I have a copy. As a matter of fact, I just got it this morning, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make a comment on this question of the report. I am informed by Hydro that this is a brief summary of an ongoing effort by Ontario Hydro to consider pollution control on a cost-benefit basis. Like most summaries, it may tend to be quoted out of the context of the complete report.

The allegation that Ontario Hydro is irresponsible with regard to pollution control is an unfair one. Apart from the conversion of the R. L. Hearn generating plant to natural gas, the air management branch and Hydro are presently completing the technical details on control programmes for the Lakeview generating station as well as other older generating plants in Ontario. Ontario Hydro pollution control efforts—

Mr. Martel: That's Gathercole's statement of last night.

Mr. Lewis: George Gathercole said all that last night.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —compare very favourably with those of any other power generation authority.

Mr. Lewis: Then he gave the minister the statement to read.

Hon. Mr. Auld: In fact, Mr. Speaker, in a previous notice to the House about two weeks ago, I mentioned that the sulphur fuel regulations in Metropolitan Toronto would not be lowered, as there were control programmes under way for large sources of sulphur dioxide. This statement was in reference to the Lakeview generating station, which has a considerable effect on air quality in this area.

In common with many other agencies, my ministry is working to develop the actual cost of air pollution on health, well-being and property. Unfortunately, the gross assumptions made in any such cost study open them up to misuse and dispute. This has not stopped Ontario from setting air quality goals which compare with those set in the US last year. Ours were set in 1968.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the minister inform the House why he didn't make information of this report available to us during his estimates when we were discussing Ontario Hydro's role as a polluter?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I never heard of the report which Mr. Gathercole, I think, mentioned was an internal report, until yesterday or the day before.

Mr. Good: A supplementary: Is the minister suggesting that these charts could be assembled without the co-operation of the air management branch of the Ministry of the Environment?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. What I said is I have never seen the report. We have been working with Hydro in a number of their plants to establish the levels and to see the optimum levels that they should reach. We were not working with them on any cost-benefit analysis as far as Hydro was concerned.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Why should Hydro suppress that kind of report? Why should it not provide it for the public interest if there is such an enormous saving of funds implicit in its recommendation?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As far as I know—I am just looking for a copy of Mr. Gathercole's comments.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Give us your answer, not Mr. Gathercole's.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Gathercole said—

Mr. Lewis: We know, you have already read Ontario Hydro's—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I recall, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of Hydro indicated that this was an internal document, a working document—

Mr. Lewis: He is a secretive chairman. He has told the committee that. He doesn't like the public.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and a preliminary report.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

PLANS OF CHRYSLER TRUCK DIVISION

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Has Chrysler Canada informed his department of any plan to establish a truck manufacturing operation in Rexdale, or in any other area other than the Windsor area?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for giving me advance notice of his question. Further to my conversation yesterday with the hon. member, my office contacted Mr. John P. Morin, executive vice-president of Chrysler Canada Ltd., and was informed that the rumours concerning a proposed move of the truck division from Windsor to Rexdale are incorrect.

Chrysler Canada Ltd. has recently moved its parts division from a plant in Rexdale to a site in Mississauga, and this left the company with an empty building of 450,000 sq ft in Rexdale. The company, as part of a study, recommended several uses for this building and one of these involved the assembling of light trucks at the Rexdale plant. Chrysler Canada does not assemble light trucks in Canada and if this proposal had been accepted, it would have meant a new

manufacturing branch for the company in this province.

I should add that this was one of a series of alternatives and the company has no plans in fact to manufacture light trucks here. The building in Rexdale is now up for sale and Chrysler has no plans to move the truck division from Windsor. The rumour started when a copy of the various alternatives for the use of the Rexdale plant fell into the hands of newspaper reporters.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

MINISTRY'S ACTIVITIES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Mr. Speaker. How is it possible for his department to go on to private property and level trees and other material there without either notifying the owner, initiating any expropriation proceedings or offering any compensation? I am referring specifically to the case of Mr. Leslie Hodgins about whom I wrote you some weeks ago and am awaiting a reply.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for writing to me. I must confess that I don't have the answer presently. I will check it out when I get back to the office.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

LAND PURCHASE PLANS OF ONTARIO HYDRO

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Does Ontario Hydro intend to purchase land for future use north of the present Bruce generating station, including the Inverhuron Provincial Park?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that as notice. I don't know of their day to day plans. I will find out.

Mr. Gaunt: And the minister will give me the answer?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You mean they can buy a provincial park, and that's a day-to-day plan?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

U OF T GOVERNING COUNCIL

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask whether he considers the 10 or so representatives of the corporate sector, appointed to the University of Toronto governing board a couple of days ago, represent a cross-section of the community? If not, what plans does he have for future government appointments to university boards of governors to broaden the representation?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I think the appointees of the Lieutenant Governor in Council to the University of Toronto council are representative of the community—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Mr. Cassidy: Which community?

Mr. Martel: The business community.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think the hon. member should realize that on this 50-member council, there is representation from faculty, from administration, from the students. We think it's important that in a new organization such as this, that there be some continuity, that there should be some experience by at least some of the members that we appoint. I think I'm correct in saying about seven of those that we have named are on the present board of governors of the university.

It's important that there be that experience, particularly in dealing with an institution as complex and as large as the University of Toronto. If the hon. member will look at the total makeup of the 16 people we have appointed he will note broad representation in those members.

ROM APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, has the minister yet decided on his analogous community representation for the Royal Ontario Museum appointments to be made this month?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There will be no vacancies until the end of this month; and we are considering people at the present time to fill those vacancies.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

HIGHWAY 404 CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. When will he have completed the close look he told us he is taking at the construction of Highway 404, so he can tell us when construction on that long-awaited road will commence?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I would hope to be able to make an announcement next week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

RETAIL SALES TAX

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Revenue, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister explain the minor discrepancy in the two statements he's made in the last 24 hours? In one he said that information about repayment of retail sales tax is not available to the public; and in the second he said information about the payment of retail sales tax is available to the public?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I never did say that it was available to the public. The hon. member is referring to a dialogue which we held here Tuesday night. And in the hubbub on Tuesday night—which was not, I think the hon. member will agree, the finest hour of this Legislature—there was an apparent contradiction—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I wasn't here!

Mr. Lewis: You heard about it!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is an apparent contradiction and quite frankly—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the minister acted for both of us.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: For all of us!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I checked Hansard, in view of the fact that the dialogue took place during my estimates and being the very fair fellow I am, I thought it would be only fair not to deduct this from the time of the question period. I was going to raise it at the opening of the estimates of my department.

However, now that the hon. member has raised it, perhaps the best thing to do would be read the dialogue, with your permission sir. I stated in a question that preceded it:

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All he has to do is to report it to the department, and make it their business to find out whether he has paid it or not.

Meaning of course, that anyone who has anything to report about someone not perhaps having paid the sales tax.

Mr. Shulman: Well now, as a public-spirited citizen, and if I am rather dubious about my friend from Sandwich-Riverside [Why he'd be dubious about him I don't know] and want to be sure he's paid it; who would I write to in your department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The retail sales branch.

Mr. Shulman: Of course, they would be able to look it up and let me know—is that the situation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, Mr. Speaker, that is a contradiction; and one would have to take it within the context of the discussion that went on, because obviously I had just said that we wouldn't give the information as to whether the person had paid the sales tax. And my answer, of course, was meant to state: Yes, get in touch with the retail sales tax branch. And I should not have said "yes," to the whole question. I should have said: Yes, write to the retail sales tax branch, but you won't get the answer as to whether he's paid his sales tax or not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

PELEE ISLAND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In your discussions with the federal transport authorities, has any discussion evolved around the township of Pelee Island and their transportation problems to the mainland of Essex county?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and we are acting on that particular situation with Pelee Island right now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

SKYWAY TOLLS

Mr. Deans: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Will the minister consider removing the tolls from the Skyway bridge at Burlington for this summer, in order to expedite traffic movement on the Queen Elizabeth Way and the area of the beach strip?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, my answer would be no, but I would take it under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

CUTBACK IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES SUMMER COURSES

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities: Is the recent direction by the council of regents to the faculties of the community colleges to cut back periods available by the faculty for summer course study from two-and-one-half to two months, as a result of direction from the minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any formal direction from the council of regents to the community colleges to cut back their term by two weeks. I would look into that and get an answer for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

USE OF NTA IN DETERGENTS

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: Why is NTA still being permitted in Canadian detergents when it is banned in the United States?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I think we discussed this in my estimates. My understanding is that there is no agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the US as to the possible hazard of NTA, or, in fact, on the American side, the nutrient effect of phosphates. But the federal Department of Health people apparently feel that it's quite harmless.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question: In view of the fact that the Americans are being cautious, wouldn't it be wise for us to be cautious as well? They are awaiting the completion of studies about the possible carcinogenic effects of NTA.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member realizes that this is a health matter, and, I guess, a federal health matter, and it's the federal agency which has been setting the standards about phosphates and NTA.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions? The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

ONTARIO PLACE TRANSIT LINK

Mr. Cassidy: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Mr. Speaker. Whatever happened to the experimental rapid transit link with Ontario Place, for which I believe he was meant to get submissions by the middle of March, or middle of April? Has he had any submissions and if so, which one has he picked?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this is an experimental track that will be within the confines of the grounds down at Exhibition Park. It is not to connect downtown Toronto with Ontario Place. This has been a misconception.

Mr. Cassidy: Which the minister encouraged during the election, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Carton: We have had presentations from nine different companies, and we are presently in the process of studying these particular submissions in order that we can determine the one that we will be choosing. We expect that this will be done by the end of August.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain, if it does not go from downtown, what benefit this experimental project will be in solving transportation problems in Ontario cities?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, in a project of this nature where we are dealing with innovations in transportation, with the technological changes, one must have a design that will be one such that they can study it under all conditions. It is of such a design that one could not have it, say, within the heart of the city, because there would be curves of a certain degree that we would want to design it for, for experimental purposes. There would be the weather conditions, and in this case there would be people usage, which is what we want, in addition to all the other factors.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions? The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

ADVERTISING STANDARDS

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Is the department considering introducing legislation concerning an Ontario code of advertising standards, requiring individuals and corporations who advertise, to list with the merchandise adver-

tised whether it is new or used so that it would not mislead the public? This particularly refers to television.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I might say that we do watch advertising very, very carefully in the interests of the consumer at all times. Specifically, in regard to television, we have called them in to see that the advertising is of an ethical nature. If the member has a specific situation or case, I would be very glad if he would refer it to me and I will look after it.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister wouldn't be aware of this, but is it right for a corporation to advertise a 19-inch Admiral portable "amazing" colour TV set at $199.95, knowing that one could not buy a new set at that price and, then, not having the set in stock, readvertising that same set four days later in the same newspaper, on May 30 and then on June 3?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As the member indicated, I am certainly not aware of this particular instance, but if he refers it to me I will take the necessary action.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mrs. Birch, from the standing social development committee reported as follows:

RESOLVED: That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Community and Social Services be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

Ministry of Community and Social Services

Ministry administration programme	$ 6,056,000
Assistance and rehabilitation services programme	$352,102,000
Children's services programme	$ 58,736,000
Community services programme	$ 10,611,000

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Wells presented the annual report of the board of governors of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education for the year ending June 30, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

VILLAGE OF POINT EDWARD

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Village of Point Edward.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes the village of Point Edward and the Bluewater bridge authority to enter into an agreement respecting the payment of municipal and school taxes for the years 1971 to 1977 inclusive. This bill has the full support of both the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) and the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who can be against it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Who wants to lobby that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, it is an unlikely union; I will say that.

VILLAGE OF WASAGA BEACH

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled An Act respecting the Village of Wasaga Beach.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides authority to establish a pedestrian mall on Main St. in the village of Wasaga Beach between June 15 and Sept. 15, 1972.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the main street the beach?

Mr. Cassidy: The minister hasn't done anything about the beach yet!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, having now dealt with the important places like Point Edward and Wasaga Beach, I now turn to a smaller municipality in the province.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a number of housekeeping items. It authorizes Metro to acquire waste disposal sites anywhere in the province subject to certain conditions. Other municipalities in the province already have this authority under the Municipal Act.

Reference is made to the term of office of school boards, additional members for the Toronto library board, deeming the Toronto Zoological Society to be a local board for the purposes of OMERS, and some other housekeeping matters. Finally authority is provided for the establishment of pedestrian malls on and adjacent to a designated portion of Yonge St. between June 28 and Aug. 14, 1972.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill and, to a lesser extent, the Wasaga Beach bill give us some cause for concern. This matter has progressed to this point and we are therefore introducing the bill and we will be asking for your support of it. This bill, as did the previous bill last year, in effect makes the corporation of Metro not liable for any damages which may be suffered by the merchants or the owners during that time.

I think this was fine when we were talking about a one-week mall or a short period of time. We are now moving into a six-week period, which is a much longer time, and there are provisions in both the Municipal Act and the Expropriation Procedures Act which are in effect being bypassed by this Act.

We don't want to hold up the mall for this summer, but we propose to ask the law officers of the Crown to give us the benefit of their advice and perhaps discuss it with Metro and other municipalities well prior to the next session of the Legislature, in case it becomes something more permanent.

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, in this bill the effect of the re-enactment of the definition section along with the various amendments is to provide for the participation by municipal councillors in OMERS and to permit benefits to be provided to common-law spouses.

POLICE ACT

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Police Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I have already given a lengthy comment with respect to the amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 28th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF REVENUE
(*continued*)

On vote 803:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a few questions about the provincial enumeration. The first question would be how much does this cost on an annual basis? How many enumerators are involved province-wide?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): It is estimated that the cost will be about $1,800,000. There will be between 8,000 and 10,000 enumerators involved.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, why is it necessary to start again in September, from scratch so to speak, when a good part of the enumeration was done in the spring?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The new Elections Act requires that the enumeration take place every year within a certain period of time—every two years, I should have said. It was felt that the enumeration which had been started would be outdated by the time it was necessary for the next return of the rolls.

Mr. Burr: Does that mean that in future, every two years this enumeration will start in September?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will take place at exactly the same time. It will be from September, right after Labour Day, to Oct. 10 every second year.

Mr. Burr: Will it take place this September in those communities where there will not be an election this fall, this December?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Burr: It will?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Burr: Well why?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will be required because the information which is required for the assessment will be involved; the information gleaned from the enumeration.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, in Essex county, it seems to me, the enumeration was largely completed in the spring, at least the Windsor part was completed in the spring. If there is to be no election in December, why would it be necessary to do another enumeration in the fall?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that that was the assessment—the assessment census and not the enumeration.

Mr. Burr: Not the enumeration part of the assessment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, just the assessment.

Mr. Burr: Do you mean that when the people were around taking the names of each person in the house and the names of the landlord and the names of the owners of vacant lots, that was not an enumeration?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a census which is taken under the Assessment Act. Therefore, it had to be taken as the assessment and not as an enumeration. Enumeration takes place under the Municipal Elections Act. The law required that the census for the assessment be taken at that time.

Mr. Burr: Can you explain to me what benefit this fall assessment or enumeration will be in Windsor? What additional information will be gathered that will justify the huge expense?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'd better outline the procedure and what are the purposes of the enumeration and perhaps avoid a lot of unnecessary dialogue.

The enumeration will be conducted by the assessment division between Sept. 5 and Oct. 10. All residential and commercial property will be visited personally by the enumerator. He will carry a form containing the existing information relating to all residents of the property. The person enumerated will be asked to verify whether the present information is correct and complete.

In all instances, both the enumerator and the person enumerated will sign the enumeration notice. The enumerator will leave a duplicate copy at the premises and retain the second copy for the purpose of preparing the subsequent preliminary voters' list and school support listing. The owners and tenants of all vacant properties will be mailed an enumeration notice at their place of residence and asked to make any corrections or additions to the information contained thereon.

In addition, he will be provided with a stamped pre-addressed envelope to which he can return a signed copy of the corrected notice to the regional assessment commission. At the end of the enumeration period, the assessment commissioner will provide the municipal clerk with a preliminary voters' list and a listing of all owners and tenants indicating their school support. A duplicate copy of this listing will also be made available to the school boards.

The municipal clerk will subsequently revise and certify these lists. There will be appropriate amendments to the various Acts making it mandatory that the assessment commissioner supply the school boards with complete lists of those persons who can direct taxes and the school boards to which their taxes are directed.

School boards can scrutinize these lists and will have a four- to five-week period during which they can apply to the clerk to correct the school support declaration of any person which they think is in error. If the clerk for any reason refuses to comply with this request, there will be a further appeal to the assessment review court.

I hope that clarifies it for the hon. member.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North). Mr. Chairman, is that a public announcement? Can we get a copy of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is not a public announcement. I just made it a public announcement. I'd be very pleased to provide copies.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York North.

Mr. Good: Just a point of clarification on that: There will be only one enumeration which will be used both for the assessment department and for the Municipal Elections Act; is that right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's correct. Each year.

Mr. Good: Each year? The Municipal Elections Act just says every two years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will be two years for the election list and each year for the assessment.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York North.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Generally speaking, the new market value assessment throughout the region of York is pretty well accepted and it is working reasonably well, thanks to a good commissioner in the region of York, Mr. McClun, who is doing an excellent job. But I feel that there is one group of people who are being penalized in the region of York because they have a different kind of soil.

Highland farms have an organic soil and highland farms are considered mineral soil, although the highland farm—due to the Cyril Park case—has pretty well established assessment at the very minimum, although it is not near market value to a lot of the farms. But in the Holland Marsh area, where there hasn't been a court on it yet, they are being severely penalized in comparison with the highland farms. Their average assessment at the present time is $1,000 an acre.

I know that the officials of your department have been working very closely with the marsh farmers for the last year and I would appreciate very much if you could tell us what progress is being made along with the farmers in establishing, say, a fair assessment. Maybe after I hear this I will have a couple of supplementaries.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the assessment division—I am sure the hon. member knows this better than I—was not a direct party to the appeals. Indeed, the assessment division of our ministry is really in sort of a neutral position in this kind of a situation. Our people make an assessment according to the law and there are appeals that can be made. The division, through its solicitors, made some settlement recommendations to the farmers who were involved. The recommendations of the division were not accepted by the farmers and they decided to fight the assessments on their own before the county judge concerned and they lost. I talked about this earlier with my officials and I couldn't see that the division could take any other position than it did. If the hon. member has anything to suggest, I would be pleased to hear it.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Well, I suggest that these growers are being penalized. Here, in the region of York, assessment, as I say, is an average of $1,000 an acre. With just a river between them, in Simcoe county—where reassessment on market value hasn't taken place—their assessment may be an average of $150 an acre. You go to other areas in the Province of Ontario, say Leamington and out near the Quebec border down near Montreal —I am talking about still in Ontario where they are growing vegetables of the same kind —their assessment is $100, $150, $200 an acre. But these people who are assessed at $1,000 have to compete in the open market. The cost for production is more, so their profit is less, but taxes are higher. I would ask that your department continue to work with these marsh growers and see if we can't come up with a fair assessment.

Sure, it has been recommended by the assessment department that maybe there should be a saw-off at $500 or $550 for top land, but then they are not on the same basis as the highland farmer where the market value on the highland farm, I can assure you, throughout the region of York in a good many cases is higher than for the marsh grower. But these people are being penalized because they are good farmers. They are using good farm practices on the Holland marsh. If you go out there today, they fertilize heavily, they are using irrigation systems, and this is the only reason that they are growing more than they do on the high land. They could produce an equal number of bushels of carrots, cabbages, cauliflower or whatever you like on the highland farms if they applied good farming practices.

I am urging you and your department go back and renegotiate with these people and see if we can't come to some kind of a fair settlement in the very near future and not penalize one block of 7,000 acres in the region of York. This is the only area that has been penalized by being assessed at market value—$300 to $350 an acre for top land and $1,000 an acre for marshland. I know of one producer in the marsh who has 18 acres of land; I don't know what he is assessed for his land and buildings, but he paid $1,900 on 18 acres of land.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Terrible!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I must say I am most sympathetic to the situation in the Holland Marsh, and—I am trying to choose

my words carefully—perhaps I could put it this way: that being sympathetic to the position in which they have found themselves, we are hopeful that in the reassessment the kind of justice will be done that I think will perhaps make everyone satisfied with the result.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Yes, but you would have to make some kind of amendment to the Assessment Act to reassess these people before 1975, because the assessment is frozen.

Mr. Good: That's right.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): It is frozen.

Mr. Good: You're stuck; there is nothing you can do about it.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Well, there are ways of getting around it—I mean, by changing the Act—aren't there?

Mr. Good: We voted against this Mr. Chairman. You guys voted for it and now you are stuck with it.

An hon. member: That's right. I remember him standing up on that one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. Does the minister have any further comment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member is quite right in view of the fact that the assessments are all frozen at this time. In view of the fact they are not prepared to make a settlement. Whatever the result of the reassessment and whatever decision should be made by any court between now and then, while reassessment might help change the base upon which they are going to be assessed. They of course will still have to wait until 1974—or is it 1975?

Mr. Deacon: We can change that. Amend the Act.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then we are going to have to amend the Act right across the board, and I don't know how we can do that. What the hon. member across the way is suggesting perhaps would result in a chaotic situation—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —if we started amending the Act for everybody. I am afraid we'll have to wait until that time.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, there is one way around it without changing the Act, the way I see it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Most of these assessments have been appealed, but only a few of them have been heard to this date. I don't know whether it is common for the department to make a recommendation that the assessment should be reduced at such time as these assessments are heard before the judge. I get the information that the ones that have gone before the judge haven't been very successful to date.

I think your assessment branch could make a recommendation of assessment; whether the judge takes it or not, at least we would have done our part by making the recommendation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre was on his feet a moment ago.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I might just add that I am advised this Mr. Vickers is representative of the farmers in the area; they have now sent a letter to our representative wanting to make an arrangement to talk along the basis of some sort of settlement. It would probably be advisable to wait and see what happens as a result of that, and we are prepared to do that. Of course I think they would have to go to the Municipal Board as a result of that.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Right. Fine.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Does the member for York Centre defer?

Mr. Deacon: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Fine.

The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Yes, following on this point. I think it brings out very well the problems that have been created by the freezing of assessment until 1974 for 1975 taxes.

Another case in point, along with the farms, is the revenue that the municipalities

are losing from Bell Telephone, simply because Bell Telephone's assessment is frozen, even though their income is going up and up. The city of Waterloo, I think, lost something over $15,000 this year because of that Bill 127 that we passed last year. The minister says we can't do anything because the assessment is frozen.

Well, let's unfreeze it in a few instances where it is causing hardship, and farm assessment is one. Another is the places where large developers have torn buildings down on land which is of high value but very low assessment. The municipality is losing a tremendous amount of revenue in those instances. Then there are subdivisions which are being developed and cannot be assessed because of the fact that they didn't move from raw farm land to development land.

In many of these instances, it wouldn't take very much work and it wouldn't take very much imagination to sort out the areas where the fixed and the frozen assessments are causing great hardship, not only to certain classes of assessments which are now having problems but to other classes of assessment where the municipality is losing a whole lot of revenue. The Bell Telephone situation is a case in point. And so is vacant property where buildings have been torn down and where practically all the assessment has been on the building and nothing on the land. Developers can sit and hold that vacant land until 1975 and pay no taxes whatsoever in proportion to the value of the land until 1975.

There is one other point I'd like to ask the minister about and see what kind of an answer he can get from his officials. When we amended the Assessment Act in 1968, we removed from it the necessity to take a canine census. We were told at that time by the then Minister of Municipal Affairs that they would do that when they took a census. Now we find that the Municipal Election Act, of course, has no provision for a canine census. Does this mean that from now on there will be no canine census taken within the municipality? Even though the provisions of the Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act has been changed to make the dog tax permissive instead of mandatory it still means that certain municipalities are going to want a dog count. How are they going to get it? Are they going to have to do it themselves?

An hon. member: Count the legs and divide by four.

Mr. Good: Nobody takes me seriously! Count the legs and divide by four! I'm sorry to put all these questions to the minister but—

An hon. member: Well, you know he's got to earn his salary sometime.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I've been handed Bill 18, an Act to amend the Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act. At third reading on April 13 of this year, apparently we took out, I am told, the requirement to take a canine census.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): You had better go back to school!

Mr. Good: The requirement for the census was never in that Act.

An hon. member: Well, it should have been.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I've never been asked about whether we should take an enumeration of dogs before.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now that the hon. member has mentioned it, it will be provided for any municipality, I'm told, which asks that we take it.

Mr. Good: Is that right? It's not in any legislation though. That's just gratuitous—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is part of the good service of the government.

Mr. Good: —service on your part.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's part of the good service of the government. In respect to the question of matters relating, for example, to the assessment of Bell Telephone and so on, I suggest to the hon. member that he await the amendments to the Municipal Act which will be here any day now. Those amendments will deal with tax policy.

Again, I'm afraid that I'm going to have to say to the hon. members that the municipal assessment is merely the process of assessing according to the law as laid out, mostly in the Assessment Act. The tax policies he's referring to, in respect of percentages of taxes and so on, will come under the Municipal Act and may very well be dealt with when those amendments come forward. That would be the time, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, when they can be debated.

Mr. Good: We've got other avenues.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the other day I was talking about assessments. I want to get into the subject of assessment of land.

I'm completely in accord with the basic philosophy in agricultural land assessment. That is, recognition that the land is only worth what its value is for the purposes allowed in the use of that land. If it's in an area where the land prices might be $10,000 an acre but, in fact, there is no way that the land can be developed under the existing zoning, then we are really being very hard on farmers. I'm glad that the court case supported the contention that when land is not permitted for development, then it is assessed on the basis of the value for which it is permitted. In other words, for agricultural purposes.

Problems do arise. A few years ago, Windfield Farms, with 600 acres was sitting in the middle of serviced land in North York. The municipality was quite prepared, at that time, to permit development on that land. In my mind, as soon as land has services available to it—the municipality is in a position to approve subdivisions under proper conditions within that land—at that point the land should be assessed at full market value for development purposes.

If we do this sort of thing, we are not going to have the problems that the Ontario Housing Corp. officials and others have brought to my attention, where they are trying to buy land and they find that a speculator is holding onto that land. He is able to hang on to the land because his carrying costs are minimal. He has a carrying cost of only agricultural value; and he is holding out for prices far beyond that.

The government has brought the services to the area, so that it is possible to develop the land. In my mind, it should not be possible for people to carry land on the basis of it being agricultural land when, indeed, it is possible for them to develop the land for housing, or whatever other purpose.

I would appreciate the minister's view on changes in the Assessment Act, which would definitely set that out. So it would not matter whether a man is continuing to farm or not. We have already gone to the public expense in providing services. If the municipality wants to develop in that area, the owner should help share the cost of those services. And where the province has indicated its wish to provide more housing, in whatever way it does in that area, then, the land indeed shall bear property taxes on the basis of market value. I would appreciate the minister's views on that.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): You would think the minister would know some answers once in a while.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member needn't be so incensed by the fact that I have to get some information.

Mr. Sargent: What does he get paid for?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I get paid to learn my job; and then do it.

Mr. Sargent: He's been there for 10 years now and he should know it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not been here for 10 years. I've had assessment for about five weeks. It officially came to the Ministry of Revenue on April 1. That is when it officially came to us.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well, I for one offer the minister compassion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So I think I really can be excused for not knowing everything.

Mr. Lewis: I offer you compassion. It is a tough decision.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't think I can expect compassion from the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. I think he just lacks compassion.

What the hon. member is really saying is that it's difficult to resolve this problem. It's a debate that has been going on in this House for many years. How does one assess farm land if, and when, it becomes suitable for subdivision; even though it is continued to be used for farm purposes?

That is something that I don't have an answer to; and I doubt whether, even if I had been here for three or four years, I'd have an answer to it.

Mr. Deacon: Surely we can put in our legislation a description when the municipality and the province have made provisions for servicing of that area; when that land would then be designated for the purpose for which permission has been given. When it's zoned, in effect, for development; at that point, assessment should be based upon that zoning.

Mr. Sargent: You're so right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has raised a question which is, at least, minor or slightly different from the arguments I've heard in the past. He's saying that perhaps there can be a formula having regard for what the municipality has done.

Mr. Deacon: The municipality and the province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. I think it's worthy of consideration. As I say, I don't have a solution at the moment. I know what the law is on it. I know what the Act is on it. It is tax policy. I think you'd have to amend the Municipal Act, and I'm not even too certain on that. It's something that is—

Mr. Deacon: I am sure there are not many amendments required.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —worth consideration. I'll discuss it with staff and the appropriate officials in Intergovernmental Affairs, as it relates to municipal taxation, and so on.

Mr. Deacon: Maybe one way we can do this, Mr. Chairman, is the way so much of our legislation is introduced. It could come in as a private member's bill, because we can get the work done as private members. Then we can debate it, and you can have a chance to assess the value of it.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think I can help the minister. He should know the answer to the problem that the member for York Centre brought up here. It's been mentioned in the House here before, that up north in a fringe area of Toronto, four entrepreneurs optioned 300 acres of land for $300,000. Each one of them put up $75,000. They signed a note but they paid no money down, and they sold the land 18 months later for $3 million. Not one of them had put up five cents. They had optioned the land and they'd made this fantastic capital gain, having done nothing to create the value in the land. So, getting back to my colleague's point here, they had done nothing to create the increased value in the land, but they moved in and made $3 million profit on this deal.

Where do we protect the municipality? The minister must know that in Europe they have a thing known as reciprocal land tax. In any land of fringe development when speculators move in and make large amounts of money, then the municipality goes back 10 years or 15 years and taxes the land retrogressively to bring that money forward so that the municipality then shares in the profit. I've talked about this in the House many times. It's a current practice in Europe to have a reciprocal land tax, and this is in line with the assessment department.

I think it's time that we got with it here, because there are great fortunes being made in speculation in land development in the fringe areas in Toronto here. The municipalities are not being protected and, as the member for York Centre said, we must have some leverage there to tax these speculators.

I hoped the minister would have known that. If he's been with it, with what's going on in the world today, he should know that. I've nothing against him personally. I think he's a good guy, but his skates are dull; that's all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have heard the hon. member in the past say I am a pretty fast skater. Now I have dull skates.

Mr. Sargent: Well, there's tricky Dick and there's tricky Al.

I'd like to ask the minister, in his plans to come into effect across Ontario, does he plan to have a yearly equalization in assessment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is yes.

Mr. Sargent: When do you plan to start that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In 1976. I had to be careful, this was written as "1796" and I know that we don't do anything that retroactively. It is 1976.

Incidentally, while I'm on my feet, that little exchange which caused some laughter, about the amendment to the Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act, my officials were quite correct. The hon. members across the way were doing a little laughing. They'd better check up on their research, because obviously they voted for the bill and didn't know what it was doing. But the bill was accomplished and that was in April.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Bill 18, An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act, did the following, under dog licensing: "Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the said Act are repealed." Section 3 which was repealed read:

> The assessor shall enter upon the assessment roll opposite the name of every person assessed, the number of male dogs, female dogs and spayed female dogs, respectively, for which the person is liable to be taxed.

Would you please give another mark to my staff?

Mr. Sargent: To your staff, not to you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not asking for any. I didn't even know dogs had ever been counted.

Mr. Sargent: I believe it. The approach of this minister to assessment is amazing. This department is the cash box of Ontario, it is the most important department, it is the cash box of all our revenue, and it shocks me that you say to me that you hadn't known about the reciprocal land tax idea. The fact that you are going to start in 1976—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This has nothing to do with revenue for the government.

Mr. Sargent: It is revenue for the people of Ontario because it's every municipality's assessment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Assessment has nothing to do with revenue for the government. We are doing the assessment—

Mr. Sargent: I know, anybody knows that. I am talking about the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are dealing with the assessment for the municipalities.

Mr. Sargent: Certainly. That is what we are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is taxation and revenue for the municipalities, and taxes on the citizens.

Mr. Sargent: And the sad part of it is we have a man like you handling all of these billions of dollars across Ontario in this estimate—because this creates the revenue by which we operate all the cities and towns across Ontario in this assessment—a man who hasn't got the tools, the knowhow to gather in this revenue. You are working now for 1976. In the interim, Mr. Minister, by not doing a yearly equalization you are going to cost us four or five billion dollars in lost revenue by not doing a yearly equalization. Do you realize that? Do you know what I am talking about?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know what you are talking about; one of the few times I do.

Mr. Sargent: By not doing it until 1976, we have four years there to get this scheme in operation—and I realize you are going to maybe triple your staff to do it, but let's get with it. This money will be lost for four years—you say 1976. There is no use getting angry at you because you just don't know, that is all.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Before we go on with the vote, can I ask the minister a question? He offered, Tuesday evening, I guess it was, to give us the information on the tax credit rebate to the corporate sector. He was going to provide that information during these estimates. I wanted to ask him where he was going to provide it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't recall what I promised at the time. I know the staff is going over Hansard and anything I had promised to produce, if it is possible to produce it, they will produce it. I don't know whether they have it as yet. The staff is listening; they will make some inquiries and find out if that is available at this time. If it is I will provide it.

There are a lot of questions you asked the other day, the hon. member will appreciate that.

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the minister about assessment appeals. I imagine that his executive director of the assessment division is aware of a request by the Essex county clerks and treasurers association with regard to the notice of appeals and the changes of ownership, changes of address, improper spelling of names, improper description of property, which caused much confusion in the minds of the ratepayers; and by the wording of a notice or hearing they were under the impression that they were required to attend at the sitting of a court.

Apparently the clerks and treasurers are asking for some revisions in the method and asking that some of these things be done through the assessment office without going to the appeal procedure. Have you got anything on that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Legislation, Mr. Chairman, will be coming forward very shortly. It has to be co-ordinated as between the Municipal Act and the Assessment Act. I really can't tell the hon. member the specifics, obviously, of what the legislation is going to be because it's a matter of government policy. It will be known in due course. All I can tell him is that these matters are being attended to.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I have three areas I want to explore very briefly, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

It may have been mentioned as I came into the House a little after you launched into the matter of assessments, but the leading matter as far as I am concerned at the moment is how that assessment programme is progressing. What stage are you at? Are you going to meet your deadline with respect to universal assessment throughout the Province of Ontario? That is one area.

Secondly, how are these assessors presently being trained? At one time, as I understood it, they took their basic training at Queen's University in a special programme. I don't think that now is so, perhaps except by correspondence, because in some way or other they are working in conjunction with one or more of the community colleges, I believe. It seems to me to be crucial to have the same standards of training because of the concept of universal assessment throughout the province.

In another area I want to explore briefly, I want to say that I have given the matter deeper consideration over the past year since the last estimates and since the last amendments to the Assessment Act. Regarding that third criterion or principle which must come into being in the case of your present mode of assessment—having gone on to actual market value assessment—I think inherent in that logically was the business of not distinguishing between structures on the one hand and land on the other.

Nevertheless, as we all know in practice, and I suspect to this day—and I would have the minister affirm or disaffirm that—your assessors do make that distinction so far as their own books are concerned. But if a thing is being taken at its market value it must be taken in its totality.

In practice, you continue to do the discreet kind of assessment of the two components, whereas when you get to court on the matter the figures are not disclosable to you and the only thing you can talk about is the omnibus assessment of the property in question. That is ongoing.

The way out of it, of course, was that you were setting up a computerized bank or something of that kind of representative values in the area and you would be watching sales closely so that you would have an external objective criterion as to what true values were. Once having established that, then even your assessors would be able to drop the business of making the distinction I am talking about.

Again, I would like to know how the minister is getting along on that programme of drawing up this particular inventory.

The third area I want to mention to the minister has to do with the split mill rate. Have we been able to determine at this latter day the impact on those assessments that you did make? You launched into the programme headstrong and vociferously, as is your wont, at an earlier time. Finding that you were getting yourself into the quagmire, and hardly able to extricate yourself from that particular quicksand, you brought a close to that programme and said, "While the ongoing process of assessment continues in this province, we'll stop or foreclose any further actual bringing into effect of assessments in various areas."

What I am still interested in, and I have never been able to find out really, is what was the burden upon the residential owner, over and against commercial and industrial assessment, in those areas in which you completed your assessment and put it into effect.

Was there something that went top-heavy? That was the chief fear of the Smith committee with regard to reassessment in principle and as such, and there had been set into it over the years the special subsidies to the residential owner which constituted something called the split mill rate concept. Was that worsened in the course of the assessments actually carried out, or has it been alleviated? What is the present situation, say in the county of Peel, touching the reassessment you make?

There are therefore three questions that I have asked the minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has lost track; he actually asked four. I will try to answer all of them.

In respect of how the programme of reassessment is coming along, I'm advised that

it is advancing well. On March 31, 1972, 86 per cent of residential, multi-residential and commercial properties in the province had been measured; 62 per cent of residential properties, 57 per cent of multi-residential properties and 67 per cent of commercial properties had been inspected.

Mr. Lawlor: May I interrupt just for a moment? Are you not doing industrial then? Is that being left out?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Seventy-five per cent of industrial properties were measured and 62 per cent inspected. I don't know how you measure them without inspecting them.

For farms, the comparable figures were 74 per cent measured and 58 per cent inspected. I think the hon. member will agree that shows pretty good progress.

As for training, assessors are generally trained by graduation from a three-year course from a community college in assessment, law, policy, evaluation theory, political science, economics, etc. These students work for the assessment division during the summer between the first and second year as part of their total training programme. Assessors are also trained by working in the assessment office and taking a three-year correspondence course from Queen's University, sponsored and controlled by the Institute of Municipal Assessors.

University students are hired and given in-service training by the standards branch of the assessment division. All three types of students are, upon successful conclusion of their training, given associate membership in the Institute of Municipal Assessors. Upon successful completion of an examination, or upon obtaining five years' experience, they are given full membership in the Institute of Municipal Assessors and use of the designation "MIMA."

These are the working-level assessors who are the backbone of the staff of the assessment division. Many of the assessors who have attained associated full membership in the Institute of Municipal Assessors take the three-year course in appraisal theory offered by the Canadian Institute of Real Estate Appraisors and obtain the accreditation "AACI." I think that is also evidence that there is a pretty good training programme for the assessors.

I think the hon. member asked about the separation as between the building and land. There is no separation in the new assessment programme; it is taken as one value, the whole of the property.

Regarding the split mill rate he referred to; I am afraid I am going to have to refer that question from the hon. member to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough). It is a question he could quite properly be asked during his estimates, because this is a matter of tax policy. I think that deals with all of the four questions the hon. member asked.

Mr. Lawlor: Just two questions arising out of that. One of them is, to what extent has this staff of assessors been increased over and above the number of assessors you took in from the municipalities? In other words, in the last 18 months or two years since the assessment got under way, has that staff had to be greatly increased?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It increased from 2,068 to 2,606.

Mr. Lawlor: Just one word about assessors. I trust that the minister and the department do move their assessors around. Despite the fact that you are supposed to have universal standards, of course the universal standard of property at Orillia, for instance, might not be and shouldn't be in terms of market value identical with that in another municipality. Nevertheless, the fault of the earlier systems was that there tended to be special privileges, a kind of giving ground to particular properties within local municipalities. That tradition having grown up, having lifted it to the provincial level, that which was parochial about it should have been obviated.

You can still get something of the same effect if the inbreeding is among assessors. The comparing of notes and the kind of work that they are doing within a particular municipality sets up its own modes of procedure and its own levels of assessment. I trust that assessors are moved to different areas throughout the province so that the ingrained interests of a geographical location will not have any impact upon the mode of assessment being conducted in that area.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there is a constant programme of transferring precisely for the purposes outlined by the hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: Especially for that reason?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Very good. I think that is all I want to ask right now.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister on the num-

ber of assessors. It was brought to my attention last year that when they were going to assess a property or farm they would be there on a certain day.

Of course, they would come out and measure all the barns and buildings and the home. When they got through, they said there would be another group along in a few days to go through and make an inspection—assess the house, the inside of the home. This seems to be very costly. It must be costly to have two groups come to make one assessment of the property and it is very annoying for the housewife.

I had a number of letters last year in regard to this. They get all prepared for these assessors to go through the home and they don't go through on the day when they notify them they are going to assess the property. It looks like duplication.

It is difficult for me to understand why one man can't assess the inside of the house or have the same men who measure the outside of the homes or the farm property. Is that the reason why there aren't enough assessors or has this been changed from last year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It hasn't been changed in respect of the matter raised by the hon. member. I am advised that the reason for it is a matter of economics. The assessor who does the inspection is a highly qualified person and is one who is therefore paid accordingly. The measuring is done by students. To do it any other way would mean, as the hon. member appreciates, a much larger staff of qualified assessors who do all of the work—a very much larger staff, as he can appreciate, with a tremendous increase in costs.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Minister, it is an annoyance to the homeowner or the property owner to have two sets of assessors come to make an assessment of their property.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can appreciate that—

Mr. Spence: It should all be done on the one day.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it would be better if it could be done by one person and one didn't consider the economics of it. I imagine if we didn't consider the economics of it, it would be more annoying to the homeowner if his taxes went up because of the increased cost of assessment.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In connection with this market value assessment, don't we have a great opportunity to really reduce our assessment procedures and virtually eliminate a lot of the problems by recognizing that people know the value of their homes or know something about market value.

What if we gave everyone the responsibility of doing their own assessment and giving the municipality the option for six months to purchase the property at that price plus 10 per cent? In this way, there would be certainly a tendency on the part of people to balance the consideration between losing their home at market value plus 10 per cent or getting as advantageous a figure as they can for their property taxes. No one knows the value of a house better than the owner, surely? What does the minister have to say on that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would only say this, Mr. Chairman, that that's a very—what is the term I am looking for?; it is not commendable—it's an unusual idea. All I would say is that if that ever comes into effect, I hope it would be well in the future when I am not responsible for municipal assessment.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I believe this system is already in effect in some jurisdictions. I should have looked that up before I brought it up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to know if the hon. member could tell me.

Mr. Deacon: It is something that is already in effect. It is one that would, because of the option, certainly place a discipline on the people doing the assessing, the owners. At the same time, it would save an awful lot of the fuss and bother and fighting that we go through now if people did their own assessing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member must know that it sounds logical and we have heard this before away back, I recall. I suppose this has happened thousands of times. Somebody is complaining about the assessment of his property and you say, "You are really being assessed on the basis that your property is really worth about $30,000." The answer in a debate like that is usually "Well, if the government thinks it is worth $30,000, let them give it to me." Just imagine—

Mr. Deacon: Which is a pretty good basis when you're a homeowner.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I know. Just imagine the difficulty that creates for an owner of a house, for example. I don't think he should be put in that position. Because he is doing everything possible to avoid—not evade—paying as high a tax as is expected of him. In other words, to do what he possibly can to keep his taxes down as much as he can, he puts himself in the position where, because he has presented a figure—he says, "I don't think it is worth more than $20,000"—he fears that because he has said that, the government—whether it be municipal or any other government—is going to seize his property for that amount of money.

It is a difficult position to put him in. It sounds good but I don't think it will ever be practical. As I say, right off the top of my head, I think that would be an unfair position to put a person in.

Mr. Lawlor: Can you hear the screams?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course.

Mr. Lawlor: You would have to have an appeal court for that one.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he could give us an indication of what policy he is going to follow at the time the new assessment figures actually come into force. It is apparent from those reassessments which have already taken place that there is a very substantial shift of incidence of municipal taxation from industrial and commercial to residential taxpayers; and from apartment dwellers to people in low-rise, single family, duplex-triplex style homes. There is going to be a great deal of inequity particularly with the shift of taxation to homeowners and tenants who are already overburdened. What plans has the government got in anticipation of this problem?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Ottawa Centre, I think I mentioned something about that the other day when the question was asked. I said then that it would be certainly a miracle if we were able to carry out this huge reassessment programme across this province without finding a lot of imbalances and quite a number of shifts which were not desirable. This is where we have to wait and see.

If, as and when there appear to be some serious shifts in a direction which is not good public policy, then a tax policy, at that time, will have to be developed. The assessment will be completed in 1973. It will be studied the year after and, as a result of having the whole picture in front of us, then a tax policy will be developed, having regard for those imbalances which may develop of a serious nature in that period of time.

Mr. Cassidy: Doesn't the minister have enough information to begin preparing the policy now? In the town of Ajax, for example, where reassessment was carried out quite early—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the difference?

Mr. Cassidy: The difference is that industrial—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the difference when we start to develop the tax policy? The tax policy is going to have to wait until all the assessments are in and completed. So, what is the difference when you start it so long as it is ready by then? When the study is ready, we can look at this thing in a logical way.

Mr. Cassidy: I can only suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is certainly bad government to wait until the problem has reached a crisis stage, as it would do in 1974 according to what the minister is saying, rather than making plans for what seems certain to be a problem.

I would give the minister an example. In the town of Ajax, for example, under reassessment, the industrial assessment fell from just under half of the total assessment in the town to just over one-third, from 47 per cent to 36 per cent. The incidence of taxation on the residential taxpayers increased accordingly. That is happening in a number of areas where reassessment has already taken place. It seems to me you can't simply say, "There may be a problem. We'll look at it in two years' time." If you do, you are doing a disservice to the province as well as to the government which you claim to represent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can't see how you could possibly argue that it's poor government to wait until your assessment is completed before you adopt a tax policy and say that it is good government to start adopting policy on an ad hoc basis. You would be running all over the map. You would be making a change here in tax policy; then three months later something

else would develop and you would be perhaps doing exactly the reverse. You can't do that. Surely, the hon. member can see that you have to wait and see the whole picture in front of you. When you have that you are in a position, therefore, to do the thing on a logical basis.

I'm told, as far as the Ajax situation is concerned, there was vacant land classed, in error, as industrial or commercial prior to the assessment. What the hon. member is really saying is that what has happened there is that we have got a truer picture of the values. This is precisely the reason for reassessment, so that we can find out those which have been over-assessed, under-assessed and, as I mentioned the other day, many, many properties which hadn't been assessed at all. In this case, apparently, this had been assessed incorrectly and the reassessment has brought out the facts.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I have a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman. Does the minister plan to do anything to tie down poor municipalities by way of the vehicle, say, of reciprocal land tax? Does he plan to investigate this plan?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My staff advises me, yes, that this is in the cards.

Mr. Sargent: That's fine. I congratulate the minister.

Mr. Chairman, could we talk about the Province of Ontario Savings Office under this vote?

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Sargent: It's under 803.

Mr. Chairman: It's after it. We'll finish assessment first.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, it is. I see.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: On the objectives of assessment and what you are going to come out with, what is the minister's purpose or intention? Between industrial-commercial assessment and residential, has the minister some goal in mind? Does he have an idea of a 60:40 ratio as between the two or is there some kind of ideal ratio which he is seeking? Does he want a 50:50? In other words, he must have some objective in mind in order to prevent a massive shift from one category to the other.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The purpose of the provincial reassessment, as I mentioned earlier—it's too bad the hon. member wasn't here the other night when we discussed this—the purpose of it is to bring out a just and factual assessment of values across this province. That won't be, as I say, many properties are under-assessed, in which case they are not paying their fair share of taxes to the municipality. And there are those cases where they are over-assessed and paying more than their share of taxes, and those which haven't been assessed at all and therefore have been escaping taxes for years. I don't think I can put it any other way.

Mr. Lawlor: That is all honey and cream. I want to know the minister's aim as far as this ratio between the two basic types of assessment is concerned. Has he some goal in mind there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as the assessment division in my ministry is concerned, it is to provide the actual value of all these properties. From there on, it is tax policy. If the member wants to know how these are going to be taxed, I would again refer him to the estimates of the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister can't soak me off like that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm trying, I'm trying.

Mr. Lawlor: That is just too mealy-mouthed for words. The minister has this year of study, precisely the purpose for that year is to measure, to sift through the computers the various possibilities and ratios.

There must be some overall umbrella policy that the minister is seeking. Either he would seek to maintain pretty much the status quo, which I don't think is possible because of diversities throughout the province. If you take a look at some of the small towns up around Midland, say, the ratio between the industrial and residential assessment is way off, and you have to get your equalization factor worked in there in order to make readjustments. The minister couldn't possibly say he is going to take them just at their face value.

Take south Peel, with all the Texaco tanks out there; you caused a total disruption when you lowered the actual value in that particular area. The minister is going to have to work a factor into the whole massive picture

in order not to disrupt homeowner policy and to send the taxes escalating in a way beyond even what they are, as our tax bills come in this month, in order to readjust and to place a greater weight one way or another, no matter what he likes to do.

If industrial assessment falls below its actual valuation, if the figure is less than what it presently is, you are going to have to artificially bring it up, I suggest to the minister.

Is that in the works and is the minister considering those possibilities?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, what we have to do is get a proper assessment figure, a proper value figure, and when we get it in 1973—we should have it then—we will then study the whole picture to see what the assessment is across the province, what it would do to municipalities by way of one tax policy as against another. Then the tax policy will be established, having regard for all of the things which have developed during the reassessment and the study.

Mr. Lawlor: That is the sagest answer the minister could have made to me. He has no goals at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying to be honest with the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: But one assumes that the minister normally is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I normally am; I always am.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It gets me into some difficulty sometime—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is implying there are exceptions, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was being honest with the hon. member by telling him that—

Mr. Sargent: Why doesn't the minister admit he is flying by the seat of his pants?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At that time, in so far as the structure of government exists today, it will not be within the purview of the Ministry of Revenue, which is doing the assessment, to speak for the tax policy of the government in respect of the municipal tax situation; it will be the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. If you want to put it this way, the assessment division is the computer for the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs and the government generally and for the municipalities.

We are doing this job for them and turning over the assessment figures to the municipalities. At the end of 1974, when this will all have been studied, then there will be a tax policy laid down.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the minister now seems to have got himself to the point where he has no responsibility at all. We happen to agree with the idea of getting equity within the residential class, and within the industrial-commercial class. That makes sense, so that somebody with a $40,000 house doesn't pay the same tax, or even more, than somebody in a $20,000 house. But is it the government's policy then that the industrial tax burden will tend to fall and be shifted over to the residential tax burden? Is that the government's policy? Because if you go on to a straight market value assessment that is what is going to happen.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no question about that.

Mr. Cassidy: There is no question about that at all, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have a question or two I want to ask the minister. He said, if I recall, that he had set out a new position in the department—senior director of field services. I think he called it. Was that job filled by competition?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is this position, and it was not put out for competition.

Mr. Lewis: Just out of curiosity, how is it that a position of that importance—I gather it is significant—would not, in fact, be filled by competition—providing people from within the department with many years of experience, an opportunity to apply for it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is, that in the view of people who had to make that decision they picked the best man having regard for his experience, for his ability, etcetera. It is their right to do this, and I presume in this case they felt it advisable to do that.

Mr. Lewis: Are there any other senior positions in the reorganization of the assessment division of the department which were not provided for by way of competition?

Other than the executive director, Mr. Gillis, are there any other senior roles in the department? After all, as I understand it, you have seven areas headed by directors and 32 operating regions headed by assistant commissioners. Were there any other jobs which were not put out to competition?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Lewis: No. So this one job of the senior director of field services was created and filled, if I am right, by Mr. Leftner without going to competition?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, I—

Mr. Lewis: Well, I am saying the obvious. I am repeating what is apparently explicit in the exchange—which is that of all the jobs in the department this, plus that of the executive director, with which I cannot quibble, was the only one which did not go to competition.

That being the case I have one or two other questions I want to ask you, Mr. Minister. Who did the reassessment of the cities of Guelph and Barrie? Or the system to be used—the basic work on the reassessment of the cities of Guelph and Barrie?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Could we go on to the next question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, the next question would be who did the major reassessment of Kimberley-Clark paper mill at Terrace Bay, American Can at Marathon, and the Domtar mill at Red Rock?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I hope the hon. member doesn't think I can write that fast?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I am sorry, the Kimberley-Clark—these multinational corporations roll off my tongue easily. I hardly have to write them. In my party they are objects of daily discussion—Kimberley-Clark paper mills at Terrace Bay, American Can at Marathon, and the Domtar mill at Red Rock?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm advised that the Department of Municipal Affairs did the assessing for Barrie, and for Guelph the municipality hired consultants by the name of J. P. Coombe and Associates.

Mr. Lewis: J. P. Coombe and Associates?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. For the companies mentioned by the hon. member it was the same consultant.

Mr. Lewis: J. P. Coombe and Associates did—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Domtar, Kimberly-Clark, any others mentioned?

Mr. Lewis: They did Domtar, Kimberly-Clark and—I told you it rolled off my tongue so easily—American Can at Marathon also? J. P. Coombe did it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Same.

Mr. Lewis: And the same company did Guelph? The department did Barrie. Did the department consult anyone in the process of doing the Barrie reassessment? Did it call in any firms? Is there a possibility that J. P. Coombe was involved in that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No consultants.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Do your people, who are with you, know whom Gordon Ogilvy, the assessor for the District of Cochrane, hired to assess the Kimberly-Clark paper mills at Kapuskasing and Smooth Rock Falls? Do you know whom John Van Rassell, who is employed at the area director's office in Sudbury, hired at the time to handle particular assessment problems in Wawa and the Spruce Falls Power Co. and the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One at a time. What's the first one?

Mr. Lewis: All right, let's take them one at a time. You've answered my questions on four of them; on Guelph, on Kimberly-Clark, on American Can and Domtar. Now, can you give me the answer to the assessment of Kimberly-Clark paper mills at Kapuskasing and Smooth Rock Falls, as distinct from the assessment at Terrace Bay?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Same firm.

Mr. Lewis: J. P. Coombe and Associates? A most remarkably ubiquitous firm. I presume a very good one. Do you know who acted in the particular—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have nothing to do with that, I am advised by my staff they were hired by the municipalities.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I understand. Do you know who handled the particular assessment problems around the Spruce Falls Power Co. and in Wawa in the district of Algoma?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Same firm.

Mr. Lewis: Same firm?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We—

Mr. Lewis: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's qualified.

Mr. Lewis: That's qualified?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My staff, at the moment, thinks so.

Mr. Lewis: Okay. You will know, Mr. Minister, or your staff will know, that subsequent to the introduction of Bill 205 on the mining properties appraisal, there was the requirement of assessment of certain mining equipment and buildings. Do you know who was hired by the department to make the initial valuation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: J. P. Coombe.

Mr. Lewis: J. P. Coombe and Associates? Well, I think that establishes some of the questions that I wanted to ask. Would I be right in thinking—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised—it might help the hon. member in his consideration—that this firm was the only firm available for this work.

Mr. Lewis: The only firm available for this work?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. In Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: In Ontario? Do you know the principal officers of the firm at the time that the work was done?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment.

Mr. Lewis: This is by way of question only: Do you know whether your senior director of field services was associated with J. P. Coombe Associates Ltd., through that period?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is yes.

Mr. Lewis: The answer is yes.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803.

Mr. Lewis: No, I am waiting for—

Having ascertained that, could I ask who makes the decision then about the appointment of the senior director, field services, without putting the job out to competition? Who makes that kind of decision, since it was the only one of all the jobs which did not—?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the deputy minister of the department, of course, is the one responsible for the administration of the department and the staff. So it would be the deputy minister and in this case the head of the municipal assessment division, Mr. Gillis.

Mr. Lewis: Does your staff know whom the executive director of the Institute of Municipal Assessors was latterly?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is yes. Want the name? It's the same one. Mr. Letton.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Okay. Well I have got the information that I think I wanted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Sounds like a very busy and capable man.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, he sounds like he is a ubiquitous fellow.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say that.

Mr. Lewis: Well you said busy and capable, so I simply used a word which was more congenial, and I think I will leave it at that. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803.

Carried.

The next item to be discussed is the Province of Ontario's Savings Office programme. There is no vote on it. Questions.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the minister about the Province of Ontario Savings Offices. What is the minister's opinion of them? What is the motivation? The reason for being? Why do we have these offices? Is it a $116 million cookie jar that you can raid for money? What is the motivation for them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The savings office was created away back in 1921. It was created through the enactment of the Agricultural Development Finance Act and as far as I can see it was, generally speaking, designed to help in the smaller and particularly rural communities. It has developed from that as far as I can ascertain.

Mr. Sargent: Why do we need it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That of course is the $64 question: (a) Do we need it; (b) if we need it, shall it stay the way it is, shall it be expanded, shall it go into other services as well? This is the thrust of all the debate over and around this particular operation over the years.

I am familiar with that, I have heard it in this House, I have read it in the previous debates. I must tell the hon. member that just as soon as we have time after the House rises I will give a great deal of attention to the operations of the savings office and satisfy myself as to what shall be done with it.

It is obvious in my opinion, anyway, that it can't continue as it exists today. You either have to go forward or you are going to go backward. Obviously we are not making a great deal of progress in the savings office at the present time by way of advance. The question, as the hon. member knows, is precisely this: That if you are going to stay in business just what direction you should take.

There have been reports on this. I have studied them as far as I have had the time to do in the few weeks I have been in the ministry. I intend to give them more study, and I can assure the hon. members that when I stand here next year something positive will have been accomplished in respect to a decision along these lines.

Mr. Sargent: Well I think that's very timely. Certainly if it's going to do a meaningful job; you have it in places like Aylmer. The north country doesn't have any at all, North Bay or Sudbury.

An hon. member: Or Thunder Bay.

Mr. Sargent: Or Thunder Bay. Really, they are a joke. In fact, these offices are a disgrace to the government of Ontario. I agree with the minister, you should—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Kill it or cure it.

Mr. Sargent: That's right! You have this pot of money available. In these very small areas, you have $116 million on deposit. The concept is good if you do the thing with the proper motivation. You could have a billion dollars on deposit and then you could do a job for the people by having them borrow money. Instead of having the loan shark operations going on, you could let them have personal loans. There could be loans for small businesses. You could do a real job for the people of Ontario. They could provide the money for themselves. There's a great opportunity to make this a meaningful deal.

In the area of business loans, personal loans and mortgages. The member the other night mentioned that in Sarnia they were paying 10 or 11 per cent for money for first mortgages and 12 or 13 per cent for second mortgages. Across the river in Port Huron the money is running between three and five per cent.

If people are allowed a co-operative deal in Ontario by putting the money in a pot and getting away from all these sharks in the loan field, I think the minister would be doing a great job in this area. But this is a mess right now.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): May I ask the minister a question in respect to the per cent paid in money borrowed last year by the province. I notice that the total cost here for money which was used ultimately by the province for its purpose is 6.67 per cent for the fiscal year 1970-1971. How does that compare with the money we had to go out and borrow in the open market? Has the minister any information here?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There was over a one per cent saving for the province. After all the bank expenses were paid and the interest paid out, the province was able to use these funds at a saving somewhat over one per cent as against borrowing somewhere.

Mr. Young: Well then, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this does point in one direction for the minister as he thinks about the future of the Ontario savings offices. There's no question that there is a big pool of wealth here. The offices we have, if he notices, have gone up from $81 million in 1967 in savings to $116 million-plus in 1971. This means that people are using these savings offices.

If we had enough of them scattered around the province to be really useful, we might find ourselves a great pool of wealth that could be used by the province at considerable savings and interest; as well as providing the kind of service which the hon. member from Grey-Bruce has just mentioned. There's no reason for example why an Ontario Development Bank and the Ontario Development Corp.—the whole service—couldn't be combined in some way with this banking system or savings system.

I've seen some suggestions that the people who operate the loan business for the businesses who need help in the province, perhaps could operate as the managers of these organizations. They could combine their functions in properly ordered offices in key spots across this province. Now, these are functions that might be performed by bringing these two particular facets of government operations together. I think this is

something the minister might think about. But certainly from the very time these savings offices were instituted, they have performed a function. People have used them, and if we had been willing to expand the facilities, certainly far more people would be using them.

I think, with proper expansion and proper development in the future, there is no reason why we can't find here a very great source, not only of funds for the government itself but a source of funds to assist struggling industries and to assist the people of Ontario in a realistic way. I bring that to the minister's attention and I urge upon him real consideration of these ideas.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I want to say to the minister that over the tenure of my life in this House, and certainly since the Department of Revenue became established, his two predecessors in his post said precisely the same thing about the Ontario savings offices as he said this afternoon.

You are the only minister, by the way, over there with a grain or inkling of mother wit. Sometimes, and a good deal of the time, the things that you say are ingenious, original, have the spark of vitality; none of which can we says about any of your other colleagues, particularly—

Mr. Lewis: And certainly not the man from Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko)!

Mr. Lawlor: Why would you, in this instance, become the master of shibboleth, and talk about going backward or forward, and stand up and seek to—

Mr. Sargent: He said kill it or cure it.

Mr. Lawlor: —in a mealy mouthed way.

It seemed to me, watching the situation in the past year or so, that you had made that option, that you had made that choice. I thought it was in the direction of expansion. You have placed ads, more than you had previously ever done, it seems to me. You have billboards advertising the operation of the Ontario savings offices. I thought you had gone onto an expansionary programme.

Listening to you today, you sound as wooly and as vague as your predecessors, still incapable of coming to any decision as to which way you want these offices to go.

You are severely restricted as things stand, within the constitutional limits of the powers of banking, charging of interest rates and what not, with the federal government. Therefore, I suppose you could run up against the same difficulties encountered by the Social Credit government of Alberta, as it then was, in seeking to set up its own internal financing system; and that of "Wacky" Bennett of a year or two ago, where they clouted them.

But it seems to me that Premier Bennett was able to circumvent the federal banking regulations to some extent and that his institutions, on a quasi banking principle, are still in operation.

In any event, if you are going to expand there is a range of possibilities within the credit services, in competition if you will with the private sector with their exorbitant loan principles, such as Household Finance and others, where you might make considerable benefits available, particularly to the small businessman in the province.

If there is an area in which you could move, and constitutionally I suspect there is, then it seems to me that you ought to move that way, because you are deriving considerable benefits. Any excessive funds that you have are placed in the consolidated revenue fund, utilized in the same way as you do all the other bursaries, various forms of teachers' superannuation and funds throughout the province, going into the central revenues for the province, which cuts down the necessity for your appearing before the international bankers, the gnomes of New York, in order to beg them for largess.

It's at your doorstep! It's at your fingertips! I would think your policy should be all forward in this particular field without any question. You should enlarge the powers of this institution to the greatest extent possible.

I would therefore ask the minister: What is your policy? Have you not really determined upon it? Would that appear to be the case?

Are you at all susceptible to the argument that you ought to expand its operations and place these savings offices in other areas in the province; and go ahead and develop to the fullest extent that you can an internal banking system in the Province of Ontario, which will flow back upon you with much bread on the water.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry. First, I want to thank the member for his compliments.

Of course, I must say that I am somewhat puzzled. He said I offered a shibboleth, that, you know we've got to do something about it.

Of course, he pointed out that this had been said by my predecessors.

Mr. Lawlor: You have been doing it all afternoon, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I appreciate it.

Mr. Lawlor: It is unlike you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, but what else can I say at this stage? The hon. member, for example, mentioned that last fall there was an advertising programme engaged in and it did bring us some $2 million in additional funds and 1,500 more accounts. In my view, that's not accomplishing anything very much, nor would it, I think, change the direction in which we are going if we opened more offices. What is that going to accomplish except getting more money in, paying somebody 4½ per cent or whatever the going rate will be, and then handing it over to the consolidated revenue fund and thereby using it for the purposes for which it is used now?

That serves a useful purpose, of course. It means that the government is getting the use of all this money at a cheaper rate than it would normally get. But if we are talking about what the hon. member for Grey-Bruce was referring to, what the hon. member for Yorkview mentioned I think, and what you, the hon. member for Lakeshore, have mentioned, we are talking about something imaginative. Something by way of not just expanding the present operations, but going into some other operations which would be fruitful, not just for the government, or even just for the bank, but for the citizens of the province—then we have to go in a new direction altogether.

I don't want to give the impression that this would be by any means an easy task, because those reports which I have read—and there have been a number of them—the more you read them the more you have a tendency to throw up your hands and say there is no direction in which you can move, you are sort of locked in.

You have a staff of a couple of hundred civil servants, who aren't really bankers, that is the kind of bankers we are talking about accustomed to handling loans and short-term notes and the usual sort of commercial banking that goes on in the banking business. If you did expand in that direction and change your thrust, they would have to be retrained. There is all this sort of thing.

There are offices around the province where, no matter what you wanted to do, those offices might better stay there because the local community has become accustomed to using them. They like the service, they like the staff, they want it there, it is serving a purpose as far as they are concerned. To change the direction of those particular operations in some of those communities would be very difficult.

I could go on for a couple of hours and repeat all of the problems that are inherent in this, but nevertheless I only look upon this—and I hope this doesn't sound like a shibboleth and self praise—I look upon it as a challenge. I would like to get something done with the Ontario Savings Office so that it will be what it should be. If not, maybe, as I say, we ought to go out of the business, because you either go forward or, as I said earlier, backward. I think that something can be done with it. I made a few suggestions—

Mr. Sargent: This is a good example of how you guys operate. You don't know what you are doing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I made a few suggestions as a private member, which didn't meet with too much success. I now have an opportunity perhaps of testing them out. I won't say what they are because I want to test them out now that I have people and the facilities to get more information and advice to test them out myself.

All I can say, if the hon. member thinks the shibboleth is not enough, I am sorry, there is nothing I can do about it except to say I accept the challenge. I hope that when I am standing here this time next year, my aim is to say to you this is what we have accomplished in the past year and it will have met with your approval.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: Just one question. You see we have never really got our teeth into that issue, it seems to me, and if the minister was disposed at all, I would be very grateful to receive from him reports or things which are not of a secretive nature, that would outline possibilities, alternatives, to what your really binding problems are. If you could supply something like that we probably could have a very fruitful debate a year from now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Chairman, on what might be done with the savings bank, it seems to me about a year

and a half ago we had several individuals, and some of them are now policy ministers of this government, who had apparently very outstanding ideas on what we might do with this savings bank. Now we haven't really heard in the last year and a half where their ideas died.

Mr. Sargent: Sock it to them, Glen. Give it to them.

Mr. Lawlor: They started to think and things went wrong.

Mr. Sargent: Real renegade there.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Perhaps the minister might well enlist the aid of his colleagues in this regard, because it seems to me that in one field alone that might be useful in this province in which there seems to be an awful lot of profit, and that is in the small loan field to individuals—a loan could be useful if it was only in $5,000 to $10,000 amounts to small industries. We have many small entrepreneurs who could usefully use this service. And I believe it doesn't have to be on a grand scale, it can be on a small scale—

Mr. Sargent: You just got yourself a job.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: —it can serve our people well, and I just say to the hon. minister that perhaps he should revive and relook at some of those old speeches, of about a year and a half ago, and bring forth some of those ideas that we might use as a worthwhile thing for our people.

Mr. Sargent: Like Windsor for instance.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can assure the hon. member that this is what I was referring to when I said I gathered all these together. They are all in the file I have been reading.

Perhaps I might just leave a little germ in the minds of the hon. members here as to one of the problems involved of the government going into the commercial business, such as loans, mortgage money and that sort of thing. One of the difficulties. You know, if a private entrepreneur, a private banker, a private finance company, loans a citizen some money, loans him $5,000 or $20,000 on the mortgage, and there are no payments made, he can foreclose. You can just picture what would happen if a government bank starts to foreclose on people who won't pay their loans. They won't pay back a small loan, they won't pay back the mortgage—

Mr. Sargent: Make Darcy McKeough your friendly banker.

Mr. Lawlor: CMHC does it all the time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —payments and so on. I'm not saying that that rules it out, but I—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They've got something like ODC that tries to collect every now and then too.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just suggest to the hon. members that a political body has to think of that.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, that is not very good.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course the hon. member did mention ODC and he must realize that in fact he is just making a point for me really, because the government has to stand up and defend itself. Defend some of the loans which may have gone bad, and why we loaned the money, and the opposition will get up and they'll—

Mr. Singer: Your defence has been something less than impressive. Substantially less than impressive.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —thrash the government for having made these loans as being poor loans, and so on, and I am not saying that is wrong. All I am saying is that you're making the point that if we start to foreclose if we had loans out—

Mr. Singer: Oh come on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If we start to foreclose on the loans, you can imagine what would happen in this Legislature, and all I'm saying to you is that these are some of the considerations we'll have to consider.

Mr. Singer: You were in the second mortgage business. You didn't do badly on that for a while.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who was in the second mortgage business?

Mr. Singer: The government.

Mr. Lawlor: The Ontario government.

Mr. Sargent: The minister now is telling us his defence is why he's not moving but—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say that at all.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you say these are the reasons why it's tricky, you say.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's right, it is tricky.

Mr. Sargent: Well, your experience in the Junior Farmer Loan Programme was excellent, it was less than one per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Was it?

Mr. Sargent: And so you are telling us now that you are not going to move because of that reason.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say that.

Mr. Chairman: Can we move on to vote 804?

Mr. Singer: Your research is something less than impressive too.

Mr. Chairman: We'll deal with this item by item. There are three distinctive departments of administration.

Mr. Sargent: Get some new troops in there, you'll need them.

Mr. Chairman: The minister would like to make a couple of comments before we start the questioning on the vote. The minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. members I hope will forgive me if my remarks at this stage seem to them unnecessarily lengthy, but I refrained from making them at the opening of my estimates. I made some comments which took about three minutes and I advised them then that I would have some statements to make when we got to the housing estimates. Obviously these are very important and I'd like to make them. I think they are entitled to know what our policy is in this respect—

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): If it is so lengthy, have you got copies?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps, we'll distribute copies, I don't know that I have them; and besides, if I give the hon. member a copy he's liable to go outside, have a cup of coffee and read it, and I'd like to see him here when I'm making the speech.

Mr. Givens: Oh, I'll listen.

Mr. Singer: Oh, your consideration for us is touching.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It's called visual reinforcement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, perhaps a short history too of the background of OHC might be helpful in assisting the hon. members to understand its operation—particularly some of the new members.

With the amendment to the National Housing Act, November 1949, which permitted federal-provincial agreement in the development of public housing accommodation, Ontario was among the first of the provinces to enter into formal agreement with the government of Canada through its agency, Central Mortgage and Housing Corp.

In the 15 years, prior to the formation of the Ontario Housing Corp. in 1964, although the total number of units in Canada was modest, Ontario led all the provinces in the development of federal-provincial housing accommodation. The creation of the Ontario Housing Corp. in 1964 was thus one significant event in a long history of concern and effort on the part of this government toward the improvement of the housing accommodation of the residents of Ontario.

The housing programme initiated and developed by the government of Ontario has kept pace with population growth insofar as it is possible to provide adequate accommodation at rentals and at sale prices which lower and middle income families can appropriately pay. In 1964, Ontario led all the provinces in the creation of a new instrument whereby co-operation between the government of Canada and a provincial government could be expanded toward the meeting of housing requirements.

The Ontario Housing Corp. was the first such corporation among the provinces. By the fall of 1968, seven additional provinces had followed suit and created housing corporations. In short, Ontario, Mr. Chairman, has led the way in the development of intergovernmental housing relationships for the past 25 years and from all points of view—

Mr. Sargent: Why wouldn't you? The federal government gave you all the money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —can demonstrate the most significant contribution in this field.

Mr. Cassidy: And the most significant housing crisis in the country.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At the present time, the total family and senior citizen housing stock in this province, with which the government of Ontario is identified, is approaching 70,000 units. In 1964, just some six years ago—

Mr. Foulds: It is 1972. That's eight years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Seven and a half years ago actually—there were not more than

6,200 public housing units under federal-provincial administration in Ontario, 6,200 units.

In 1971 alone, there were 20,650 dwellings started under the various programmes of the Ontario Housing Corporation designed to provide Ontario citizens with public and private accommodation at prices they can afford. The number of starts incidentally—It's too bad the hon. leader of the NDP isn't here; he took me to task quite often on this score—

Mr. Young: He is listening to you in his office.

Mr. Grossman: —is slightly in excess of the number I predicted on April 1 last year during the Throne Speech debate when I said, and I quote from Hansard:

> It is the government's hope that of the programme announced in the Throne Speech, at least 20,000 units will be started this calendar year. This indicates a 25 per cent increase in the corporation's efforts over its 1970 record year.

It is significant that of the 20,650 starts actually made, 11,450 were public housing rental units and this represented 65.5 per cent of all housing starts made in all of Canada during the year.

The programmes of OHC have expanded into more than 200 municipalities—that's for the benefit of my hon. friend from York-Forest Hill. The programmes of OHC have expanded into more than 200 municipalities. OHC continues to develop in relation to local requirements as they are conceived within the local community and brought forward from municipal councils.

What are the social and economic justifications for such a substantial housing programme? Surely it is clear that the major consideration in government intervention in a field as complex as that of residential construction, and traditionally the realm of private enterprise, is social.

At the same time, the basic push in the direction of meeting social requirements is a fundamental economic fact; namely, that there is within our population a substantial number of person, both individuals and families, whose incomes are insufficient to enable them to meet rental payments or purchase a home with their own resources. There is, in short, an economic gap between the requirements of the market and the income available to certain individuals, elderly persons or elderly couples and certain families, usually very large families with low incomes.

If these facts alone were not sufficient to induce a government to launch the kind of programme we have initiated and developed in Ontario during the past eight years, then there were other important reasons.

The fact is that we have known for a long time that there is a strong association between physical and mental illness and poor housing conditions, between crime and delinquency and poor housing conditions, between violence in our society and poor housing conditions, between a whole host of social and environmental evils and the housing conditions of the poorest sector in our society.

Within the last 25 years our attention has been directed more than ever toward the suffering of relatively poor people, socially disadvantaged people of low income, individuals and groups in our society who simply cannot afford to attain the kind of housing that will enable them to live decently and as productive citizens.

Moreover, the fact of this fundamental lack within their standard of living has meant a deep-seated dissatisfaction and alienation which, in many American cities and in many other countries has led to violence, destruction of property, disregard for the rights of other human beings, and in a very real sense, a total breakdown of the social structure.

There is no question that the housing programme of the government of Ontario plays a very large part in maintaining the adequacy and the stability of an estimated 200,000 persons who reside within our public housing accommodation. Very often these persons have had an opportunity for the first time in their lives to live within a physical setting which gives them some purpose in life, which gives them the adequacy and privacy that they should have as citizens, and which gives their children a possibility to upgrade and maintain themselves to a far greater extent than perhaps their parents or grandparents.

In brief, the major social achievement of the public housing programme has been a significant upgrading in the lives of the vast majority of the families admitted to public housing, particularly during the past two decades.

It is not merely that these individuals—elderly persons and couples, families and their children—enjoy adequate physical accommodation, but they are also provided with what has now become a total environment in which they can enjoy all aspects of their daily lives.

The social and recreational facilities, the daycare centres, the teenage drop-in centres,

the sports facilities, the playgrounds, the skating rinks and the hockey facilities all contribute to living standards which include not only existing, but living, with opportunities for an environment in which children and adults can thrive.

These have been the objectives of government involvement in housing, and this is the type of environment for living which the government, through Ontario Housing Corp., has provided and will continue to provide.

No sociologist or social scientist of any discipline can yet demonstrate the ultimate significance of these developments, because all these programmes in Canada are in fact relatively new. The eight years since the Ontario Housing Corp. was created is a very short time in the history of a province which is as vast and as populous as many countries.

No one can measure, for example, the extent to which decent and adequate housing accommodation in Ontario has changed the lives of many people. Moreover, no one can measure the extent to which public housing prevents far worse and far more numerous incidents of delinquency, alienation, violence and despair than we are already accustomed to seeing in this very fast moving, fluid and sometimes terrifying society.

Ontario is a good province and our cities are good cities in which to live.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will listen, he will hear.

Granted there is still work to be done in some inner-city areas, such as certain ones in Toronto, but even Toronto, among the great cities of this continent, has no substantial blocks of streets that can be called slum districts. Pockets of inadequate housing that do exist are being eliminated or upgraded. The core of the city is preserved even from expressways, I would say to the member from Forest Hill.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Our citizens do not fear to walk on our city streets. This did not just happen by itself. There are many factors—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, there sure are.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —social, economic and historical—that have contributed, and one of the major social factors in my view has been this government's housing programme.

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When one considers the number of men, women and children now living in pleasant and adequate housing as a result of the government's initiative, one must also ask where those people would be dwelling now were it not for the government's housing programme. No doubt, we would be in the position of many other North American jurisdictions which are now agonizing over the problems—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, don't be silly, there are social and cultural factors which Ontario has never experienced.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —of what to do about over-population, what to do about urban decay, what to do about restoring law and order. Despite this, there are members of our society claiming to be knowledgeable who say that public housing developments are breeding grounds for vandalism, drug abuse and a host of other evils of society—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, we have heard that before.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —including even the high infant mortality rate.

Mr. Sargent: Stan Randall gave that same speech two years ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I say to the members of the House—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I don't believe that on this side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and I wish to emphasize this, that there is no conclusive evidence to support charges of this nature against public housing developments or the tenants of public housing.

Mr. Lewis: Well, of course not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if the hon. member is going to interrupt, let me say to him now regarding his interruption, if he says, "Of course not," I would appreciate it very much, as I mentioned earlier, if some of the members of his party, sitting in this House, would just get out on the public platforms and say exactly the same thing that they pay lip service to here. In other words, when they are arguing against public housing, then you get up publicly and say—

Mr. Lewis: We have criticized your ghetto housing—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course you have done that.

Mr. Lewis: Not to talk about it in the terms you have talked about it. What a piece of chicanery. There is a qualitative distinction between the two.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will discuss them.

Mr. Lewis: This piece of sophistry you are reading into the record now, such Tory tub-thumping about social needs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is sophistry when it comes from somebody else, but it is from your little kind heart when it comes from you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there are those who object when OHC plans to build a housing project in their neighbourhood. Valid objections, of course, receive our attention, but more often than not, the objections raised against subsidized housing would not be voiced if the project were a private housing development.

Mr. Lewis: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Often, when we get to the root of objections of this sort, we find an underlying prejudice against people who live in subsidized housing, because the feeling is that those people are subsidized.

I will quote from a letter recently received in my office, just a few days ago, and I will not identify the source other than to say that it is a form letter written in the first person and circulated for signatures in a district where an OHC development is planned. One part of the letter cites a purported lack of facilities in the district, and includes this paragraph with these words: "This, to us, does not appear to meet the needs of the Ontario Housing Corp. residents." A very commendable concern for your potential neighbour.

However, the next paragraph illustrates the underlying attitude that so-called OHC residents are somehow a separate class in our society, and I quote the paragraph in its entirety.

Mr. Lewis: But you make that distinction.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The paragraph:

> Being honest, and including some emotional reasons, we are concerned that OHC residents have a different lifestyle that will adversely affect our community, especially in the large numbers contemplated for this development.

Mr. Deans: But you have made them that way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where have we heard that chilling ring of such words before? This is not a new kind of prejudice. In short, we have heard those words for generations. A few years back the words were, "If you let them in, there goes the neighbourhood." Can anyone here really point out any neighbourhoods that have deteriorated because of the location of public housing? That is a broad statement because we have so many.

We have over 600 housing projects across this province. I haven't heard of any, nor have I seen any, and I have been around a lot of them. On the contrary, neighbourhoods are frequently upgraded by public housing. And I'll prove that too.

Mr. Lewis: Who is going to prove it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In many cases—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, speaking—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —speaking in the forum of this Legislature for the public and all else who will hear.

Mr. Lewis: The only thing that stops public housing is your unwillingness to build it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If you don't want to listen to it—if the hon. member doesn't want to listen to it, he is at liberty to leave.

Mr. Lewis: No. I am listening.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well then listen.

Mr. Lewis: I am not leaving.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just listen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, isn't it time we got our thinking straight?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Any kind of prejudice by one group against another is unreasonable and totally out of place in our society. But prejudice against so-called "subsidized people" is doubly unreasonable. Why? Well,

who in our society is not subsidized in one way or another?

Why is there no stigma against students whose university education is subsidized in the form of bursaries, grants and loans? Indeed, I doubt if a single parent signing the letter mentioned earlier would change our system of providing free or subsidized schooling for their children from kindergarten through university.

Society does not stigmatize homeowners who purchase houses at subsidized interest rates under government-guaranteed mortgages. It does not stigmatize farmers who receive crop subsidies, or plant and other business owners who are subsidized in the form of tax incentives and tax relief.

Mr. Lewis: This is the greatest political diversion I have heard in years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We accept, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —we accept subsidization of our national transportation systems, our national broadcasting system, our cultural development. It follows from this that the attitude towards those who receive subsidies for living accommodation requires some serious review and some deep thought. When we accept nearly every other kind of subsidization in so many facets of our society—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —what possible justification can there be for reaction against public subsidy of something so basic as shelter?

Mr. Lewis: What reaction is there, except of the kind you describe?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shelter—so necessary as a healthy environment in which to raise children, so important as a decent home.

And what of the so-called lifestyle of people who accept such subsidies? What does "lifestyle" mean? Does if refer to strength of character?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To family relationships?

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To educational level?

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To what one expects from life?

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill ought to be just a little careful—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because there are some statements he made—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, Order. Let the minister finish his statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member gave me a lecture—about a 20-minute lecture the other day—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —which contained some comments which prove he needs a little lecturing in this particular part.

Mr. Lewis: Why don't you go to Stratford and read it from the stage?

Mr. Chairman: Would the minister proceed with his speech?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why doesn't the hon. member be quiet and listen? Because I know we are going to have to listen to him at some great length later.

Mr. Lewis: No, you are not going to listen to me at some great length.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And in a very derogatory and prejudiced fashion.

Mr. Lewis: No, you are not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will listen, he will get a chance to get up soon.

Mr. Lewis: And it won't be this kind of claptrap either.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely we have learned that there are some of those negative qualities present in members of every segment of our society, from the poorest to the most affluent. And the good qualities present in the majority of our people are also present in those who receive subsidies.

This government will not ignore those who need shelter assistance. And it will avoid

segregating those it helps. Our policy will continue to be, to mix subsidized housing with the unsubsidized. In this way we will have a better chance to achieve understanding—an understanding by people in both types of housing—that there is little real difference between them.

I am not suggesting, sir, that the majority of our Ontario people are opposed out of hand to the principle of assisting certain citizens to secure decent shelter.

Mr. Lewis: They certainly aren't.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I am not without sympathy for those good citizens who have worked hard and saved to provide their own homes without special assistance, only to find that a subsidized housing development is planned for their district. These people may say, "Sure, public housing is fine, but why does it have to be in my neighbourhood, why not somewhere else?" To those people we say that we must find areas that are suitable and land that is available.

When we reap the benefits of a democratic society, we also accept the responsibilities. When we are given the opportunity to prosper, we must also accept some responsibility for those who generally through no fault of their own are less fortunate and less able to provide their own basic needs.

From our good and hardworking citizens we ask for tolerance and an understanding that there can be no public assistance more worthwhile than a subsidy that helps fight against misery, poverty, disease, crime and delinquency.

Mr. Givens: It sounds like a brotherhood speech.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is in the self-interest of communities that our government has taken up that kind of fight, for without it we will not have the kind of communities in which we would want to live. It is every man's right—

Mr. Lewis: How many houses are you going to build after this preamble?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to be given an opportunity to reach for a better life. Each of us, I believe, has a role to play in providing that opportunity.

Mr. Cassidy: You need a heavenly choir to background this stuff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: While I was anxious, Mr. Chairman, to make this statement on our social housing programme, OHC's involvement in this area tells but half the story of this government's housing programme. As the hon. members know we are deeply involved in assisting families into home ownership, and this is a direction we intend to pursue with ever-increasing vigour. In the home ownership area we have carried out a design competition for innovative low-rise multiple family housing designs. Many of the excellent entries received will be applicable to rental accommodation as well. A number of these designs will be built for families in urban cores.

We have also marketed some 10,000 serviced building lots in 32 municipalities, including Metropolitan Toronto, where two large offerings have already been made—297 single and semi-detached lots in Etobicoke and serviced land for 650 dwellings for sale in Malvern. Moreover, the more than 1,700 acres at Malvern, which will eventually house some 43,000 persons, is one of a number of major land assemblies which OHC is developing out of its land bank of more than 12,000 acres.

Mr. Lewis: Ten years late.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: OHC innovation in land servicing is best highlighted by some 200 acres in Chinguacousy township, east of Brampton, where with the co-operation of the township, an experiment which could have far-reaching savings in land servicing costs is being carried out.

In addition, this government, through OHC, has greatly assisted the development of condominium housing and is associated with nearly 14,000 condominium apartments and townhouses, the bulk of them in the Toronto area. The development of this new form of ownership has had the effect of keeping down the rise in house prices, of maintaining private rental at or near current levels, and of offering an adequate supply of housing to families with low down payments who wish to step up into ownership. These programmes and initiatives are reflected in the housing estimates we are about to consider.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would say the social and economic justification of public housing will be measured by those who come after us, perhaps 10 or 20 years from now. In short, decent, acceptable housing represents an investment in our most im-

portant commodity—people. There can be no other investment with greater potential returns.

It is with this conviction, Mr. Chairman, that we continue to mount Canada's—and perhaps the continent's most significant rental and home ownership housing programme.

Mr. Lewis: Do you have a copy of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, we'll give you a copy.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to bind the first edition for sale to future generations.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Chairman: I understand we are doing it item by item.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, fine.

Mr. Chairman: So, on administration first.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in regard to administration of this department, having, as the minister said over 200,000 people living in their homes, the administration experience that I am going to relate to the House in a few moments indicates that things are in a very serious state.

An editorial in the Globe and Mail some time ago had a picture of the minister there, and the heading was "A dubious policy." It talked about the department under Allan Grossman, and it said:

> This department's performance has been questioned most recently by the Provincial Auditor who said its senior financial management is weak. "I am concerned," the auditor reported during the winter, about the number of errors in the accounting entries and the weakness in controls over equipment and appliances, and in procedures relating to the purchase of certain goods and services." Could it be that our auditor is trying to tell us something?

Now when Mr. Spence will bend to say there is something wrong in the department it must be very serious when he'll say that. The editorial said:

> Could it be that they are trying to tell us something? Perhaps the Ontario Housing Corp. is, in its financial stewardship, slovenly, and given to squandering public money?

Recently I had some discussions with regard to operations in the maintenance of this department, and indications are that not only are the top civil servants, deputy ministers and the ministers in Ottawa cozy with developers, but now we have evidence that the lower echelon in this department plays ball with contractors, costing the taxpayers in Ontario untold millions of dollars.

We have been coming to this House here for years, and we see them tearing up the sod two or three times a year and laying it back in again. I am talking about the practices in this department of the temporary help servicing the Ontario Housing Corp. by contracting out. The term is "contracting out." I have a lot of documents here, Mr. Chairman, which show that the officials have friendly contractors, who are friends of the Ontario Housing Corp. officials, and who are not using permanent maintenance people but are calling in these outside contractors who are employing labourers, new arrivals in the country, who can't speak English. And we can vouch for this—that they are employing these people, selling them to the government, to your department, Mr. Minister, for $5.50 an hour, and the contractor is paying them $2.25 an hour. He is working them, not a 40-hour week, but a 60-hour week. And they can't speak English. This is the case with hundreds of people.

I suggest that these shady methods are costing the taxpayers of Ontario millions of dollars every year. The things I am going to show here, in the unit costs themselves, are small and they may not sound as if they are a lot of money. But when you relate this to the fact that we have 200,000 people living in Ontario Housing Corp. dwellings, apartments, and you name it, and the maintenance factors, then we are talking millions of dollars. Although we can never be able to find out how much money you are spending in this area, we can show the method by which you are doing it.

Judge Little's report, and he is the author of Bill 105, went on to say—I will read it here:

> The practice of engaging by contract tradesmen on maintenance projects be discontinued with the objective of including such maintenance personnel in the bargaining units by which parties will be negotiating a new type of agreement, commencing with the year 1971. The employees engaged on a seasonal basis for less than six months would be excluded from bargaining.

But there is a vicious thing happening here. The officials of the department have got a programme against the CUPE maintenance union. The senior vice-president of the CUPE union was told that he would have to use his car to carry around paint equipment from job to job and the snakes that they use for cleaning sewers. He has been with the department a long time—he is a senior maintenance man—and he is now being demoted because he won't use his car in government work.

Another senior maintenance manager of CUPE who is in charge of one of the projects here is being demoted because of his stand against contracting out, over permanent employees. I will give you some examples, Mr. Minister, of what is going on, if you don't know and you probably don't.

The first item here is in the glazing in housing. I understand that in the glass factor of all the housing units there will probably be a $1 million worth of glass replaced each year. This document, if I can find it here in all this maze of papers, shows that the cost of a piece of glass 30x30 which we are talking about, would cost $4.95 if installed by a permanent employee. But the cost which we're paying these glaziers now is $14.95.

You relate this 300 per cent difference to a $1 million factor and you are paying $3 million a year for glazing that would cost you $1 million if you had a permanent crew that was doing the glazing work. The motivation for this story is that this government is discouraging the CUPE maintenance union and are contracting work out to contractors who are making fortunes using this cheap labour.

There is an example here of the CUPE rates for maintenance people. It is $3.87 per hour. If we take the high and the low which you are contracting out for—in carpentry, the hourly rate is $7.50; in concrete it goes as high as $8, but the CUPE rate is $3.87; in brickwork, it is $7.50 per hour as against $3.87; in painting we have a fantastic amount of money that is being spent to upgrade properties with painting contracts. These contracts are let out. They are not done by employees of the maintenance group. That would cost $3.87 an hour for painting but they are paying these painters $10.50 an hour.

The minister has his senior officials there, and if he can relate what is happening in dollar bills here—as a businessman it shocks you. For electrical maintenance men in CUPE it is $3.87 an hour. You are paying from $10 to $12 an hour for electrical people by contracting out. In hot water heating $3.99 is the figure in CUPE, but the figures here start at $11.30 and go as high as $11.50.

An hon. member: What was that one for?

Mr. Sargent: Hot water heating. Now for hot air heating—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's for plumbers.

Mr. Sargent: Yes sir, I imagine so, or a steamfitter.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Changing a washer.

Mr. Sargent: That's good, Reg. I'll give you an example of that—what it costs to change a washer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How can you get a plumber to do that?

Mr. Sargent: Well, you have staff who do that, Al, I mean CUPE maintenance staff do that. My dad was a steamfitter and he and I installed the heating system in our house. I know more about plumbing than most of these guys who are getting $10 an hour.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Unlicensed plumber?

Mr. Sargent: I mean it is so ridiculous. I am trying to talk—you should be concerned about this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You know why you did that so cheap? You're private enterprise.

Mr. Sargent: I was compelled to. I had to, I had no money to hire anybody else. I had to do it myself.

Mr. Gisborn: You couldn't get it inspected though.

An hon. member: How long ago was that?

Mr. Sargent: Oh, 100 years ago—but you see what I am trying to get across. In plumbing here, it is $3.87 an hour, that is the CUPE maintenance payment to their people. It ranges from $9.50 an hour to $11.30 an hour. And in the ceramic tile, laying asbestos tile, it's $3.87 to $7.50 an hour. Now the untold millions of dollars that we are talking about—it's scary that these people have the contracts with your—now I don't say your senior officials—they have the contacts with the man in charge of maintenance for Metro Housing. And he has some cosy deals, I am told—I am not going to bring in any names because it's libellous—but he has some cosy deals—

An hon. member: Not in this place it isn't libellous.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I mean I don't—people are involved here in the union too—he has cosy deals with these contracts that they go on, and they get trips out of and things like that. But, this one fellow, a man named Rose, has all these contracts for all the major gardening. And they had their own snow-ploughing equipment in the department, for all these projects, and they sold that and they contracted that out.

Now this man Rose that has the majority of the gardening contracts, he is the man who is hiring these people who cannot speak the language, working them 60 hours a week, and he is selling them to you for $5.50 an hour and he's paying them $2.25 an hour.

Now, here's a case for the Driftwood Project on 401. It was a chain night lock that the caretaker was not asked to do. You even hire—send out—deals like this to contractors for chain night locks. It could have been done for $5, the lock shop charged the OHC $25. This isn't a very orderly presentation but I am just—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well then you should resign.

Mr. Sargent: We have a case here of this Rose—Douglas Rose Landscaping deal. He's got this contract for planting tulip bulbs, and he's getting $5.50 an hour for planting tulip bulbs. And it develops that the caretaker of the project said there was not one tulip bulb planted in the whole project. The man who signs this is the caretaker of 3190 Kingston Rd., a Mr. Smith.

Mr. Lewis: OHC project, that is the one.

Mr. Sargent: But not one single bulb has been planted, and I have no doubt about other projects at this time.

Mr. Ruston: Perhaps they planted the bulbs upside down.

Mr. Sargent: Another case here—

Mr. Lewis: Is that a private apartment, Eddie?

Mr. Sargent: No, an OHC apartment. This is all we see; now the CUPE executive are getting shafted by these people. They won't have permanent employees in maintenance. They are contracting all this stuff out to contractors who buy cheap labour and sell it back to the government for a profit. If I am not conveying this, I want to say that it is a cozy deal with these contractors.

I have here a selected list of people they have to do business with. There is a firm here named McDonald. Have they ever got a good one going. No it isn't Donald MacDonald. This is McDonald Appliance.

Mr. Lewis: You see, this is Don Roach coming back to haunt you. On the one hand, telegrams congratulating Bert Lawrence on his trip to Cuba, on the other hand special information to the opposition.

Mr. Sargent: This is regarding a refrigerator which is vouchered for—a refrigerator with a punched evaporator—I don't know what that is. It cost him $121 to repair it, and you can buy the fridge for $105.

This is a project Gilder, Dec. 16, 1971. The maintenance man of the project could have repaired it for $38 but he never had the opportunity. In Edgeley they had a $30,000—where is Edgeley? Have you got a project called Edgeley?

Mr. Young: Right up in my territory.

Mr. Sargent: Well they had a project there and they spent $30,000 in shrubbery. It's the same old nonsense—the stuff wasn't put in the ground; 75 per cent of the sodding is dead. The project is three years old, he says, and they had 50 per cent of the floors—

Mr. Young: Lot of shrubbery still growing there.

Mr. Sargent: Fifty per cent of the floors in this project—

Mr. Lewis: Have collapsed.

Mr. Sargent: Collapsed. The chair rungs went through the floor. They had to replace the floors in 25 houses. The thing that is interesting here—they didn't call back the contractor who originally had done the project; they called in a new contractor to make good.

I could go on here and talk about other things—snowploughing, appliance deals, and how to get on this special list, and all this. But the thing is that we have the heat being on these senior executives of CUPE. They are being demoted because they will not use their cars to carry sewer equipment around.

I asked this man, "What kind of a car have you got?" He said, "I have a Chrysler." I said, "That sounds pretty fancy." He said, "It is an old, old Chrysler, but I still don't

want to carry sewer equipment for the government in my car." I said, "Hell, what is the answer?" And he said, "Well, why don't they buy cars for government work?"

Mr. Minister, I think we have to have a bit of dialogue with you—

Mr. Lewis: I would think so.

Mr. Sargent: To know what the hell—what kind of a show you are running over there, if you are running it. The floor is yours.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well do you want me to answer these individually, Mr. Chairman? Of course I can't deal with all of the rather rambling statements and charges the hon. member made. In the first place they are to a large extent indefinite.

Mr. Sargent: Do you want these documents?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question, for example, about how much it costs to install glass—to put in doors, etc.

Incidentally these maintenance contracts are put out by tender, and part of the agreement is that they have to pay the prevailing wage rate. Whether the people are able to speak English or not, I don't hold that against them. In fact I am very pleased that they are hiring that many people who are newly arrived immigrants and who are very anxious to work.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): And paying that kind of money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have to pay the prevailing rates.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is no answer at all—absolutely no answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will give me a chance? If the hon. member would tell me how he arrives at, or how his informant arrives at any conclusion as to how much it would cost for our maintenance men who are on staff. Incidentally he said we won't take on people on permanent staff. He is comparing what the permanent staff said they could so something for, as compared with the people on the outside. We have approximately, I am advised, we have over 600 on permanent maintenance staff in Metro. So we have maintenance staff—quite a lot of them and it is probably a good thing in any case, aside from other considerations to have private contractors doing maintenance as well, as you can compare the nomics.

Now the hon. member is comparing the economics. He's saying in the first place that somebody has told him that we on the permanent maintenance staff, somebody on the permanent maintenance staff has said, we could do this for $3, and it has cost over $4 in the case of windows $4.50, and the outsiders are charging $14.95.

How could you compare? How can they do that? The maintenance man in the first place is not in that business. What is he saying? That, "If I do a window for you I am going to charge you $4 and something"? Or has he figured out, in the view of the hon. member, that it would take that much time to do the window? Has he figured out the time element?

Mr. Sargent: Let me ask you this question. That is his job—maintenance. His job is to maintain.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not what I am asking the hon. member. If you answer that question we can perhaps have some alogue which will bring up facts. He is saying that the maintenance man in the first place has got to be provided with glass if he is going to put in glass.

Mr. Sargent: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How much glass are we going to provide him with?

Mr. Sargent: Four dollars worth of glass.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What size? Where are we going to get the $4 worth of glass? He is going to have to go someplace to get the glass. And he has got to bring the glass back.

Mr. Sargent: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I presume he has to go to get some putty.

Mr. Sargent: Well you are sharp today.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And he is going to get all the other equipment to put that one pane of glass in, and if the hon. member can tell me—

Mr. Cassidy: You show a great familiarity with the working world.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —what we are paying civil servants, or anybody is being paid today, that the windup is he going to put that in for less than $14.95, he hasn't asked for anyone to fix a pane of glass for a long time.

Mr. Sargent: But you must realize you are not doing one pane of glass, you are doing—

Mr. Chairman: Order please, the hon. member has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There aren't 10,000 panes of glass that go out in each project at the same time. There may be two panes of glass in this one, and 10 miles further on in Metro there may be two or three panes of glass go out there. I mean the hon. member as a private businessman should know that he doesn't really believe in what he is saying.

As a matter of fact he is the one man who has got up here over the years and I heard him ad infinitum, ad nauseam about how much better it is and cheaper it is to get things done through private enterprise. Because your civil servants, as he has often said, loaf on the job, they take coffee 14 times a day. It costs you ten times as much he always says.

Well we are not saying that. All we are saying is we have maintenance staff who have their regular duties, and we have contracts out to do these various other things, to fix up window panes and so on. He went into the realm of electricians. We do not have licensed electricians, we do not have licensed plumbers, we don't have a license for a lot of things.

It is all right for him to say he and his father used to fix things themselves. Well, when we have trouble at home that is minor, I do it myself; I can change a washer too, and I will do all those sort of things.

I can just imagine what the hon. member would say if he found out that the public housing corporation of this province was going in and doing plumbing, or allowing plumbing to be done by unlicenced plumbers, was allowing electrical work to be done by unlicensed electricians. The first thing he would get up and say is—I've heard him say, as I say again, ad nauseam—"Why are you building up the civil service to be such an empire? It is going to take in three-quarters of the population of this country, this province." Now he is telling us to take even more public servants on the payroll.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): You didn't say that, Eddie, did you?

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Surprised at you, Eddie.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member should just think of what he says. If he has any evidence, and it could happen, with all the many contracts that are out in the Ontario Housing Corp., that somebody who has bid for a contract is charging more than another contractor offered to do it for, who was qualified to do it, then I think he has something.

But the comparisons he made—he is comparing apples with oranges—there is no comparison. He really hasn't made his case.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much. You know we used to get old John Robarts in the corner and he'd say, "Well what are you going to do about it?" We have a man like you—what are we going to do about it? You have no sense of balance at all.

I am talking about a fact that you must realize, that a maintenance man must do something. What does he do then. If he can't fix plumbing or electrical faults or glass, what does he do? You see, it is basic that a plumbing man must be a licensed man to put in new plumbing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just what you would expect.

Mr. Sargent: I have the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are caretakers. He will do what you might call—

Mr. Sargent: Is that what he told you? You didn't know yourself?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course he told me. Who was expected to show me? Do I listen to the hon. member for advice? My staff advise me.

Mr. Sargent: All right. What did he do then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: After all, Ontario Housing Corp. is a big corporation. I answer for them in this House but I don't know all the details like who fixes a door. Of course, my staff will tell me if I ask them. The fact remains that our maintenance man will do ordinary repairs—well, I suppose they call it that at the garage, running repairs. He'll fix the cupboard, he'll fix the doors. He'll perhaps change a washer too—I suppose he'll do that. He'll do all those things. But when it comes to some specialty like putting in new glass, fixing up glass, he has got to phone somebody I suppose who has glass—somebody who is in the business of doing it.

And when he wants some electrical work done, they have got to bring in an electrician. When he wants real plumbing done, he has got to have a plumber. And presumably he doesn't do the painting himself—painting goes out by contract.

If the hon. member is looking for things, I can give him more things. I could give him more legitimate things to pick at. My staff may not like it. But I have been out at some of these projects. I came to one place and there was a complaint about painting, that they didn't think the person who had the contract for the painting was doing his job. I got on the telephone, and that thing was cured in very short order. Because they have these complaints, from time to time.

And, of course, with all of the contracts they have out, somebody is always trying to cut some sharp corners. Of course, sometimes they are not found out as quickly as they should be. And when they are, the corporation takes whatever action is deemed necessary. They cancelled out some contracts. They have warned others they will cancel out contracts. It's a huge corporation. As I told the hon. member there are over 600 projects, close to now 70,000 units. It's a big job. But the comparison he has given, means the hon. member has—

Mr. Sargent: Will you please let me have my—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I have the floor now.

Mr. Sargent: I had the floor before you took it from me.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister is replying.

Mr. Sargent: I want to ask you some questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was going to ignore the hon. member. But I thought otherwise. A member of this Legislature is entitled to answers to the questions. The fact remains that he has been led down the garden path by someone who has an axe to grind. I can almost tell him—I could tell him who gave him that information. I mean it's very obvious.

Mr. Sargent: I feel sorry for that guy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is ridiculous. There are people who are dissatisfied because they haven't had the contract, and they will complain about that. Maybe some of them are legitimate. But the hon. member would have to bring forward better evidence than he has to date, or at least to this moment, about any legitimate complaints. The fact remains that we send these out for maintenance—these maintenance contracts are let out by tender. They go to the lowest bidder, if he is a qualified person. If he doesn't do his job, and it's found out, he soon is let out.

And the hon. member can rest assured that if they are not doing their job we soon find out. Because we have a lot of tenants, who are ready to complain as tenants are all over the world. They'll complain at the first drop of a washer. I can tell him that. And we soon find out about it. Indeed, and this is just as good a time to say it as any other time, one of the complaints we have from people who are not tenants of our public housing project is that we give too much service.

I don't know where the hon. member lives, but if he lives in an apartment house, let him try and get some service at night. And I can tell you at our project we have a 24-hour service. You get on the telephone if you have any difficulties. And, if it's a serious one, someone will be there. Well, I suppose most of the time.

I want to make sure that I am not putting myself in a position. Somebody will read this statement and say, "What's he talking about? I called somebody at 4 o'clock in the morning three weeks ago, and they weren't here until about 8 o'clock or 10 o'clock."

But they have service which a lot of other people don't get. And a good portion of this is due to the fact that this is an agreement we have with private contractors, with private maintenance contractors, under private maintenance contracts that they have to provide that service.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the minister has missed the whole point I am trying to bring about here. The fact is that, if we look at the broad picture, if you are spending $5 million a year to upgrade these properties in painting—if that is the figure—if you can do it for a third of that by having a maintenance painting crew, then that's what we are talking about.

In the area of glass, if you are spending $3 million a year on glass, if you can do it for $1 million, that's what we are talking about—by putting on a glazier crew available to do this job, to specialize the way you do it in an area of business. It is a shocking thing to me that the minister does not grasp—I'm not talking about one pane of glass or one can of paint—the overall picture where we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting that, for example, we should have

a crew which will look after replacing broken glass?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is he suggesting we should have a crew of licensed plumbers? That is what he is saying, a crew of licensed plumbers.

Mr. Sargent: I didn't say that; I didn't say plumbers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Electricians?

Mr. Sargent: I said painting.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right. Earlier the hon. member was making a point. He was comparing what it cost to do a plumbing job by a private enterprise firm, a private enterprise plumber as against one—

Mr. Sargent: I am saying a maintenance man can do the majority of that stuff we are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A maintenance man does the majority of things he is qualified to do and he is allowed to do being unlicensed. Now, is the hon. member suggesting we set up these various departments within OHC?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir, certainly, but you guys won't do it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely he has no idea that that is going to be cheaper than what we are doing now, where we are paying somebody to look after it at so much, either when you put in a pane of glass or—

Mr. Sargent: I am telling the minister it is costing $3.87—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, what is the member talking about? He has been around this House long enough that even ministers of the government will tell him that in most of these kinds of instances you are better off doing it on the outside. As everybody appreciates, when you start getting permanent civil servants to do some of these things and when they don't have sufficient work, you know, what do you do with a civil servant? You can't fire him, you have given him a job, he has a career.

I don't have to say that, I just have to read the hon. member's speeches back to him. He has constantly said we take on too many people in the civil service to do work which could better be done on the outside.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the very point I am making is the fact that we have no idea how much money the government is spending on maintenance, on painting—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Sure the member has. He just has to ask us, we have these figures.

Mr. Sargent: How much money was spent on upgrading and painting last year on OHC projects?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we'll have that. If we don't, we will get it afterwards.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister have a ball park figure? Would it be $5 million on upgrading and painting?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why give the member a ball park figure? We can give him the exact figure.

Mr. Sargent: When would the minister give me the figure?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will try to get it for the member after the dinner hour.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Then, Mr. Chairman, I am saying this. The minister says it is not good business to pay a man, a permanent employee, $3.87 an hour to paint, but to contract out for $10.50 an hour?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member used the figures, I didn't.

Mr. Sargent: Those are the figures.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Whose figures? Whose figure was it that you could get it done for $3.87?

Mr. Sargent: That is what the minister pays his people in CUPE.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We don't pay them in CUPE.

Mr. Sargent: I gave the minister the figures a few minutes ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But the hon. member is using a figure. He says that a man we have on our maintenance staff or the head of the CUPE union has said, "If you let our people do it, it will cost you $3.78." What does that mean?

We have a man on staff who is a maintenance man and somehow or other they have gotten down with a sharp pencil—I don't know whether he has spoken to the staff about it—he said, "Now, look, if we have our man do it, here's what we figure it costs."

That is forgetting he has other duties to perform. I mean, the $14 figure may be exact but the $3.78 figure, that is just pulled out of the sky.

Mr. Lewis: That is presumably an hourly wage.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, you can't figure that out.

Mr. Lewis: Well, presumably that is what he is quoting, the hourly wage.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am quoting unit prices, I am talking—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But the hon. member says I don't understand it. It is obvious he doesn't understand it. He is taking a figure which has been devised by somebody in the union, a member of the staff of OHC who is on a 40-hour shift or a 40-hour week, and he is getting paid so much a week, and he says I could do that work for so much.

Well, how does he arrive at that figure? He says, "Well, I think it would take me half an hour or an hour", even if he has taken into consideration that he hasn't got the pane of glass and that he has to go someplace and get it, and that he probably knows nothing about how to put in glass, but that person has said, "I think it would cost $3.70 of my time to do it."

You know, that is a great way, that is a scientific method, I suppose the hon. member would say, in deciding what it would cost. The comparison is absolutely invalid, it doesn't mean a thing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before the recess I would just like to get something else on the record because I wouldn't want it to go by. First, the hon. member was kind enough to read the article by Kenneth Bagnell, or referred to it, of April 19 in the Globe, in which it has this—they always use a very handsome picture of you when they want to say something nasty about you—and they pointed out the comments which were made here, and some vague reference to the auditor's report. But he didn't do me the kindness of also reading the answer—the reply which I had written for the Globe and Mail and which appeared in the Globe and Mail, in reply to this old chestnut, and that's what it was. It was an old chestnut. This has been discussed in this House in the past and let me point out about this so-called auditor's report of so-called comments—

Mr. Sargent: Slovenly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the auditor didn't say it was slovenly, that is somebody else's words, maybe yours, or maybe the columnist's, I don't know. The matters to which the auditor referred were about two years old, and they were minor in nature, and they were corrected. Just as soon as I get a report from the auditor every year, I look at it. A memo goes out to staff what have we done about this, what are we doing about it, and I am just advised that at a recent meeting of the Public Accounts Committee the auditor has stated that all of these minor things which have been mentioned—there wasn't anything major in the whole business—have been corrected. Am I wrong?

Mr. Cassidy: That is completely untrue. Millions of dollars outstanding and—

Mr. Bullbrook: Do you realize what the auditor of this province considers minor?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What was that?

Mr. Bullbrook: Do you realize what he has been considering as minor?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What was that?

Mr. Bullbrook: What the auditor of Ontario has been considering as minor?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said, what the auditor had said in his report about OHC—

Mr. Lewis: The auditor of Ontario isn't a good witness for the Crown in this case.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —were minor things. There wasn't any suggestion of impropriety or loss of funds or anything gone astray. He was saying—

Mr. Cassidy: Millions of dollars given away unnecessarily.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was saying that the bookkeeping hadn't been done correctly. That's what he mentioned in his report—

Mr. Cassidy: It was not bookkeeping. It was far more than bookkeeping. You can't pass it around like that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's what he mentioned in his report. The hon. member for Ottawa doesn't know what he is talking about. He is trying to bring in extraneous matter—

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): What do you know about bookkeeping?

Mr. Cassidy: Of course I do. I have been sitting in that committee.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —which have nothing to do with what we are talking about now.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well before the 6 o'clock hour, if I may, the minister has a great talent to slough aside, by minor variation, the points that my colleague from Grey-Bruce makes.

I would be very interested tonight, for example, if he might come back to us, and talk to us, about some of the major problems that my colleague from Grey-Bruce brings up. And that is the distinction between the contracted price, that you give your independent contractors, and the amount that they pay to their own employees. Because if I recall, there was a disparity almost unconscionable — in one instance, did my colleague say $5.50 an hour being paid by way of independent contract, and that independent contractor pays his employees $2.20 an hour, $2.25 an hour? That's not bad really with administration of the normal 10 per cent markup, for head office and other expenses—that just happens to be 100 per cent increase, so I would like tonight, perhaps, we can get into that, forget about the glaziers—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is quite simple. He doesn't have to wait until after—

Mr. Bullbrook: I have no doubt your answer is simple.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is suggesting—

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): So is the question. Anybody who knows anything about it would realize that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is suggesting that we are paying—that OHC is paying, for maintenance, so much per person, per hour—who is employed by the private contractor, and that the private contractor is therefore keeping a great deal more of this than he should and is paying—

Mr. Sargent: And it is true.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But we don't pay. We are paying a flat amount for the contract. Now if the hon. member is complaining about the wages that the contractor is paying to his employees, that is another matter altogether.

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: What is your point of order?

Mr. Bullbrook: The point of order is that, respectively and unintentionally, the minister has misled the House in this respect. I was almost absolutely certain that you said before, that you assured yourself, that in connection with these independent contracts, they were paid the minimum wage.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I didn't say that.

Mr. Bullbrook: What did you say?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said that our contract—

Mr. Bullbrook: We'll look in Hansard and see.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that our contract requires that they must pay the prevailing wage. Now if there is any—

Mr. Bullbrook: Well then, you must know what that wage is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member can bring out the name of any contract that the OHC has in existence with any maintenance company, where they are not paying the prevailing wage, then he has a point and we will look into that—

Mr. Bullbrook: Well that is not the point we're attempting to make at all. Does the government of this province feel no obligation, at all, to ascertain what the markup is for these independent contractors, whether you get the lowest tender or not—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. So long as they pay the prevailing wage that's all right.

Mr. Bullbrook: So in point of fact your department could be subject to the very thing that rocked the Department of Highways years ago—where there was coercion, internal cohesion between the contractors themselves. Goodness gracious, you just don't accept a low tender. Well, we'll go into it.

What we are talking about now is, you see, that the minister now, Mr. Chairman, throws up his hands. He no longer says to the member for Grey-Bruce, "You don't know what you are talking about." This is what I am putting to you. I say the government of the Province of Ontario has an obligation to see what these independent contractors are mak-

ing out of the blood and the sweat of these people whom they hire. Now you have an obligation—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My obligation is to see that we pay the prevailing wage.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister said, Mr. Chairman, that you ascertain they are getting a fair wage.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said we must pay the prevailing wage.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well let's find out tonight what the prevailing wage is.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Amendments to the Police Act, statement by Mr. Yaremko 3331

Brant area local government review, statement by Mr. McKeough 3332

Sale of the former Mercer reformatory property, statement by Mr. Snow 3333

Senior citizens' week, statement by Mr. Brunelle 3333

Regional government study on Chatham-Kent, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3334

Purchasing practices of Department of Municipal Affairs, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3334

Vannini report on Toronto police, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. Yaremko: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3334

Strike at Kitchener plant of Dare company, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3335

Investigation of strike-breaking firm, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Lewis 3335

Strike at Dunnville plant of Lanark Manufacturing Co., questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 3336

Removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward County, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 3336

Tanker sunk in St. Clair River, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Lewis 3336

Reorganization of Whitby hospital, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Dukszta 3337

Hiring of pregnant school teachers, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Deans 3337

Spadina rapid transit, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Givens 3338

Disturbance at Lakeshore psychiatric hospital, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Shulman 3338

New Toronto airport, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Bullbrook 3339

Annual reports of police bodies, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Singer 3339

Waterloo region amalgamation, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deans 3339

New Toronto airport, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deacon 3339

Prosecution under Surveys Act, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Bounsall 3340

Ontario Hydro-Electric Advisory Council, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Good 3340

Hydro pollution control report, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Burr, Mr. Good, Mr. Lewis 3340

Plans of Chrysler truck division, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. B. Newman 3341

Ministry's activities on private property, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Shulman 3342

Land purchase plans of Ontario Hydro, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Gaunt 3342

U of T governing council appointments, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Cassidy 3342

ROM appointments, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Lewis 3342

Highway 404 construction, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Deacon 3343

Retail sales tax, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Shulman 3343

Pelee Island transportation, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Paterson 3343

Skyway tolls, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Deans 3343

Cutback in community colleges summer courses, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Deacon 3344

Use of NTA in detergents, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Burr 3344

Ontario Place transit link, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Cassidy 3344

Advertising standards, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. B. Newman 3344

Tabling annual report, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Mr. Wells 3345

Village of Point Edward, bill respecting, Mr. McKeough, first reading 3345

Village of Wasaga Beach, bill respecting, Mr. McKeough, first reading 3345

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 3345

Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 3346

Police Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading 3346

Estimates, Ministry of Revenue, Mr. Grossman, continued 3346

Recess, 6 o'clock 3381

No. 85

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF REVENUE
(*continued*)

On vote 804:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): What's Mr. Chairman's direction?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia on vote 804, item 1.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Minister, good luck.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, I offered to get some information during the dinner recess. I offered to get, for example, the total cost of some of the maintenance contracts, for Metro.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): At what rate per hour?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The glazing was $192,000. Heating, ventilating and plumbing, $322,380. It should be of some interest that, of course, we don't contract everything out. I don't know whether the member for Grey-Bruce knows that. We contract out about 44 per cent and 56 per cent—ground maintenance and so forth—is done by staff. The staff wages for this 56 per cent is $1,031,704. For the 44 per cent under contract, $802,710.

In respect of the glazing, I would point out to the hon. member that really, his information was completely incorrect. As an example OHC pays so much per square foot; it doesn't make any difference how much time is put into the job. If they need a window replaced, the amount paid, for example, for 24 oz double diamond, is $2.50 a square foot. And the average window, they tell me, is three square feet. Most of the windows would be replaced at a cost of $7.50 a square foot. Where the hon. member got his $14.92 is something I don't know.

That price includes the supply and cutting of glass, including waste, complete installation where necessary, work by other trades to complete the job, such as carpentry, metalwork, painting and caulking.

The only comparison you could make—and I think, as I said, comparisons in this case are really not valid because we are not talking about someone else on staff charging for a particular job. So I think the only comparison you could make would be to take a look at the salaries we pay.

The service man general, who, presumably, would be the man to do this sort of thing if we were going to have staff do it, is paid at a rate of $3.87 per hour and that is labour only. Of course, it wouldn't include such things as materials, storage, the glass itself, breakage, things of that nature.

I could go down the list and point out how a labourer is paid $3.61 an hour, going all the way up to caretakers, $3.88; senior groundsmen, $3.99; heating servicemen, $3.99; senior servicemen, $4.12; and so on. They range all the way from $7,500 for a labourer to $10,316 for a chief operating engineer.

Those are the 1971 salaries, and the hon. member should remember that in addition to the salaries paid, the fringe benefits are over 20 per cent—20 per cent of the amount of the wages—and in case it helps his consideration any we are now in negotiations with the representatives of the staff, CUPE, who I think in the first instance are asking for an increase of 40 per cent.

Painting: The contract for painting, for Metro Toronto, for the year 1971 was $1,359,285, and this is also on the same kind of basis. The contractor gets so much for a unit with one bedroom, so much for two bedrooms, so much for three bedrooms, four bedrooms and so on.

Mr. Sargent: At what rate per hour?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No hourly rate. The hon. member wasn't listening. If he comes in and he has to do a bachelor apartment, it is $105.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is $105 flat. God help us if we paid on an hourly rate, it would probably cost $500 a room. You make a contract with somebody; you say, "This is what we want done, what do you bid for this job?" And that includes materials and everything else. One bedroom, $125; two bedrooms, $150; three bedrooms, $175; and so on. I am advised that 21 companies are involved in doing this work in Metro.

There was also some implication by the hon. member that a firm—and I didn't catch that; my staff reminded me about it and don't want to miss it—that there was some implication by the hon. member that a firm by the name of Rose got all the business, and that he mentioned something about a cosy deal.

I have the list and in Metro L. Douglas Rose got three of the jobs and out of nine bids he was the lowest bid on those three jobs. There were other jobs as well, of course; there were half a dozen other jobs. But the point I am making here, of course, is that Rose was the lowest bidder on the three jobs.

The hon. member for Sarnia raised the question about the responsibility of OHC, being a government agency, concerning itself with what wages were paid by contractors when the contracts are let out. Section 13 of the contract—of the tender, I am sorry—reads as follows:

> It is understood that persons employed on the work shall be fully qualified to perform the work required, and shall be paid by contractors, not less frequently than semi-monthly, in accordance with the current Province of Ontario fair wage scale, as amended during the course of the work in the location of the site of the work. The contractor shall ascertain the applicable fair wage rate in accordance with the attached scale.
>
> The Public Works Creditors Payment Act RSO 1970, and any amendments thereto, applies to the performance of this contract, and Ontario Housing has all the rights and powers set out therein. The contractor shall certify on all accounts rendered for payment of money under this contract that he has complied with the provisions of this clause using wording to the following effect:
>
> "I/we certify that all workmen employed on the same job have been paid in accordance with the current fair wage scale and all other creditors relevant to the work have been paid as required by the Public Works Creditors Payment Act."

And, Mr. Chairman, attached to that is the scale of the Ontario Department of Labour conditions and fair wage clause. I should think that should satisfy the hon. member that the corporation is doing everything that can be reasonably expected to make sure that those people who are employed by the contractors are receiving a decent wage.

Mr. Sargent: The minister has a very smooth way of glossing over. Everything is fine and dandy, and there is no hanky panky, etc., etc.

Now if we do nothing else we can create in the minister an awareness that people are getting fed up with the slovenly methods you use. In the wording of the Auditor, your operation was a slovenly operation. Those were his words, not my words.

The information that I am given, Mr. Minister, is that you are paying at the rate of $10.50 an hour for your contracting out in painting. Your yardstick is on a per-house basis.

My only submission to you is this: In the area of business when you are spending $1.3 million on a painting operation, you could cut two-thirds of the cost by having your own crews, which you would do in the area of business; you would have your own special paint crews. But you don't elect to do it that way. You want to have your people in front of you take the easiest way out. You say they contract it out because it is easier that way.

But I am saying to you, Mr. Minister, that your department is known to the 500 members of CUPE as having no regard for money—that that is only the tip of the iceberg, as it were, that the waste that is going on is fantastic. I can tell you that these people have a right to make observations and, rightfully so, they bring them to a member of this Legislature to reveal this waste.

So in that one item, I say you can save $750,000 by modernizing, by streamlining it. If you had an efficiency survey that is one thing that you would do. You would say, "How are we doing this?" and, "We can save possibly three-quarters of a million dollars in just one operation."

So, I do want you to say that everything that I have brought up today, your refrigerators, this MacDonald Appliance Service have an inside track there—they did a $121

repair job on a refrigerator that only cost $105.

Now you shake your head. That isn't true? It is a matter of fact.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In my own household—

Mr. Sargent: Now you must realize that these facts must be traced down, and you must ask, "Why are these things happening?"

As I said at the outset, these are unit costs and they don't mean very much when you talk about one item.

When you translate it, as you have done by figures like this, then it's a big buck that we are talking about here.

I could go on and develop the things I have here, but I think that I would be wasting the time of the House, because you are not going to do a damn thing about it anyway. We are just going through this—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sargent: Sorry, sorry, sorry. Give him a laugh, Jimmy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just want to make clear, Mr. Chairman, when a charge is made which leaves a cloud over the operations, you know I have got to put things straight for the record. The hon. member made some comment about the Auditor having used the word "slovenly." You don't have to quote it, I have it in front of me. I'll quote it to the hon. member.

He never said anything about "slovenly" at all. The Auditor was referring in his report to something that had occurred a year or two before, and it wasn't anything of the nature the hon. member implies.

He said:

> Problems continue to exist in obtaining financial statements for audit from Ontario Housing Corp. and Ontario Student Housing Corp. In addition, I am also concerned about the number of errors in the accounting entries and the weaknesses in the controls over equipment and appliances and the procedures relating to the purchase of certain goods and services.
>
> While it is appreciated that these organizations have been under a constantly increasing workload and heavy financial involvement of other levels of government, it is recommended that the corporation strengthen their senior financial management. It is our intention to work closely with the corporations on an early completion of audited financial statements. If this goal is to be achieved it is essential for the corporations to give this matter a high priority.

And indeed Mr. Chairman, I made a statement to this House as a result of the Auditor's very pertinent comments and told the progress we had made since the report had been written, and I have handed to me Hansard of June 6, which is two days ago, for the committee on public accounts.

> *Mr. Deacon*: I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the Provincial Auditor had some comment to make in his report for 1970-1971 on page 37—

Which is what I just read, Mr. Chairman—

> Where he states: "While it is appreciated these organizations have been under a constantly increasing work load"—referring to Ontario Housing Corp. and Ontario Student Housing Corp.—"and having financial involvement with other levels of government, it is recommended that the corporations strengthen their senior financial management."
>
> Maybe Mr. Spence would have something to say on this?
>
> *Mr. G. H. Spence* (Provincial Auditor): That comment primarily was concerned with the state of the books of the corporation, not with the individual business dealings with mortgage loans of CMHC and the city of Toronto.

That is for the benefit of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), who tried to confuse this.

> We weren't suggesting that there was any shortage of expertise there, but we did find considerable trouble with the accounting for their transactions. That was what our reference was to here. It was really the accounting transactions.
>
> *Mr. Chairman*: And do you know, Mr. Spence, if these weaknesses in accounting transactions have been attended to?
>
> *Mr. Spence*: Well, there are one or two that we are hoping to clean up this year. But we have gone into it very extensively and we are satisfied that progress has really been made. They have a new man at the helm in the financial end, or at least the accounting end of it, a Mr. Brian Crowley, and we think he is making real good strides, and we have confidence in him.

And Mr. Chairman I think that brings the thing into its proper focus, the suggestion that there was some hanky-panky, as the hon. member refers to it, and so on, is entirely out of order.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Just incompetence, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Essentially it wasn't incompetence at all. The Ontario Housing Corp. started in 1964. It expanded at such a rate that it was difficult to keep up with all of the bookkeeping that was required, and

the accounting and, as the Auditor has pointed out, in dealing with other levels of government—and the organization wasn't really built to the extent it should have been—and the Auditor quite properly wanted the statements in a little earlier so they could check them, and so on. When this was reported in the printed public accounts most of this had already been corrected, and, quite properly, that is what the Auditor's job is—

Mr. Cassidy: That is not true, Mr. Minister. You blew a million dollars.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The ministry gets this all the time.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no corporation, or any company, or any jurisdiction in the world that has everything 100 per cent, except, of course, whatever corporation or company the hon. member is going to be the head of some day in the great distant future—it will be perfect. This corporation, having regard for the tremendous job it has done in some seven and a half or eight years, and the big organization that has had to build up over that period of time, the tremendous number of units and the tremendous number of projects it has created, has done a remarkable job. The number of jurisdictions—

Mr. Sargent: That isn't your money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If you don't want a song and dance like that, stop making charges which put a cloud over the heads of people of integrity doing a tremendous job in a very difficult field.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nickel Belt has the floor.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Mr. Gisborn: The point is that when we proceeded into vote 804, Ontario Housing programme, you, Mr. Chairman, announced that we would take them item by item.

Mr. Chairman: Item by item, yes.

Mr. Gisborn: I would like you to separate the items as to their intent—administration. We have been dealing with for what I thought was for the last hour the rental housing maintenance programme.

Mr. Chairman: It seems to be the general administration of the office. The hon. member for Nickel Belt has the floor.

Mr. Gisborn: That's what I would like to have determined now—because when I take the floor after they have rambled all over the place, I don't want to be told that I'm out of order. Because I want to deal with the opening remarks of the minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I rise on a point of order?

Mr. Chairman: Well we always try to alternate between the two parties—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: You are doing it now on a point of order; I think it's very fair of you really. But I think Hansard will disclose to you, respectfully, Mr. Chairman, that you recognized me to begin with. The minister began to talk, and you then recognized the minister. I just want to bring that to your attention.

Mr. Chairman: I am fully aware of that, and then your colleague sort of stole the floor from you.

Mr. Bullbrook: Surely I hope that you, Mr. Chairman, won't permit that type of theft again.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Particularly because you want to be fair.

Mr. Chairman: No, I hope not.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Really, what do you consider to be petty?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Bullbrook: It really was not petty.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, what I wanted, by point of order, Mr. Chairman, was that you define the items in administration, the break-off point. I was under the impression that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce has been talking about rental housing maintenance, which is the next item.

Mr. Chairman: Well, really, administration is a pretty broad term. I think the hon. member will have to admit it's bound to overflow into some of the other items, but generally speaking, we try to keep it to the

administration, which is the policy in the branch, at least.

Mr. Gisborn: Okay, then, may I have the floor on the next vote?

Mr. Chairman: Well, if your colleague will defer, that's fine.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am a very peaceful, quiet, young man—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: When it showed 3 o'clock this afternoon and there was another chairman in the chair. I indicated to the Chairman that I wanted to speak at that time, and I've been holding my peace as successive members have risen to speak. And I want to have my say as of 3 o'clock, and I didn't have any peanuts tonight—

Mr. Singer: Right, you are entitled to do that.

Mr. Givens: So, I want to know, Mr. Chairman, whether I'm going to have an opportunity to say what I want to say tonight—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Be patient, just be patient.

Mr. Givens: —before you start recognizing everybody else under the sun, because they happen to be pugnacious enough to get up and bull their way in. Now if bulling your way in is the way to do things around here, I'll show you how to bull your way in. And nobody has more bull than I do.

Mr. Lewis: You have never met a china shop until you have met—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Bull in a china shop. You are right.

Mr. Givens: Now, do you have a list there of people who indicated that they wanted to speak at 3 o'clock?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is quite right. He was—

Mr. Lewis: Can you discipline the Liberal Party? That's what he is begging for.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for York-Forest Hill is quite right. He was waiting patiently for half an hour, or an hour—

Mr. Singer: He is a very patient man.

Mr. Chairman: —before 6 o'clock. His own colleagues kept him busy. But in all fairness, we try to alternate the questions between the two parties, and we hope to give the hon. member for York-Forest Hill an opportunity as soon as possible.

Mr. Deans: He's right after me.

Mr. Singer: Very fair chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Now, which one of the NDPs is going to have the floor?

Mr. Singer: Want to call the Insurance Act? Tonight would be a good night.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the reason I raised the point of order, is because I like to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: —stick to the chairman's ruling that we deal with them item by item and—

Mr. Singer: That we'll abide.

Mr. Chairman: The chairman's ruling is that the House decided they wanted to discuss this, more or less, item by item. And item 1 is administration, the general policy and the housing at OHC.

Mr. Lewis: Right, the hon. member for Hamilton East has the sense—

Mr. Gisborn: Okay, Mr. Chairman, then I'll try to confine myself to the administration. This is the minister's branch, and start off by saying that I was heartwarmed to hear the statement from the hon. minister—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, put me just ahead of Singer.

Mr. Gisborn: —prior to the introduction of this vote 804.

Mr. Sargent: A real tear jerker.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): I thought there would be a fire under you, to be heartwarmed by it.

Mr. Gisborn: It sounded to me like a very repentant enunciation of the guilt of this department, the minister's department, in their policy of providing housing for people in Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: Never before have we heard such a socialist document from the minister administering the housing programme in Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Your members call it claptrap. Is that socialist philosophy?

Mr. Lewis: Coming from you it's claptrap; coming from us it's socialism.

Mr. Gisborn: As many have said, they didn't understand who you were speaking to while you were speaking. On that side of the House there were two other members who weren't listening to the hon. minister and on this side, there were an astounded group of people wondering just what point the minister was trying to get across.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): I understood it.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, you would understand it.

Mr. Gisborn: But nevertheless, his enunciations on a social approach to housing was well received over here, and we just hope you can live up to that enunciation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It just sounded that way.

Mr. Gisborn: But one thing disappointed me. When the minister rose and said that he begged the indulgence of the Chairman, and that he'd like to make an opening statement before we went into the Ontario Housing Corp.'s programme under vote 804, I expected he was going to make some comment on the federal government's position in regards to housing in Ontario and Canada in particular. And I want to refer to the leaked report called the Charney report. I want to just briefly quote fom an article in the Globe and Mail of Friday, March 24, 1972.

I am going to use the article because it is a little more clear for my own use, rather than an excerpt from a critique of the report. It says this:

> A confidential report prepared for a Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. task force on low income housing says housing is "almost a byproduct in a conglomeration of builders, developers and financial institutions committed to the routine of making money."
>
> And CMHC is also oriented to marketing interests rather than to consumer interests. The report says the private sector of the industry is "involved in low income housing only insofar as delivery of this housing corresponds to the objectives of the influential members of the industry."
>
> The report, written by Melvin Charney, a professor of architecture at the University of Montreal, and Serge Carreau and Colvin Davidson, also from the University of Montreal, is one of the six prepared for the CMHC task force none of which has yet been made public by CMHC.

Now that is all I am going to quote from the information I have, that was gleaned from that report. But it is pretty devastating as to the federal government's position toward housing for the people in Canada.

I was taken aback when the hon. member for York-Forest Hill rose yesterday, on the opening of your estimates, and headed right into housing, criticized this government strongly for their ineptitude in providing housing for low income people, and never said a word about the ineptitude, the appeasement and the collusion of the federal government with the private developer, and the real estate business and the landlords in this country.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Even after the way Trudeau used him in Ottawa.

Mr. Gisborn: And I would have hoped that the minister, would, in his opening remarks—and maybe when I sit down he will—give his opinion. If he hasn't seen the report yet, or hasn't read and taken interest in the press statements on the report, then there is something wrong with the information bureau of his department. We are entitled to know his opinions, because the excerpts gleaned from the report are pretty devastating as to the federal government's approach to supplying public housing in Canada.

I hope that the minister will make some comments on that position because it has been due to the scepticism of this party, for many years, that the housing programme in this province and across Canada has been related to the whims and wishes of the private developers, the landlords and the real estate associations in this country.

The balance has only been such to stop an outcry at the devastating lack of public housing, rather than go ahead with a programme that is needed. And now that we are getting this kind of a report, we are starting to surface the real problem.

To get off that, and hope the minister will answer it, I want to deal again with the problem that I think is related to what the

hon. member for Grey-Bruce said, but in a different context; the administration. When we are dealing with projects we can only deal with them as local MPPs, as we see it, in our own districts. And when he relates to the administration of a project by the department, we have to do the same thing. We have to relate to how the project in our own locality is being operated.

I don't have to restate some of the pleasures I have had in relating over the year problems that we have found in the Hamilton project. I also have to admit that I have had good co-operation and saw many good changes. We saw the change from what I described at one time as a commissar approach—an approach without dignity to the people who were using the housing—to one of definite enlightenment. I have to give credit to the department that after my complaints over the years, we have now what I consider a very well operating housing project in Hamilton, in all its aspects, in four or five different areas, in the Hamilton area.

But there still remain some things that we want to get cleared up. Relating now to the situation of maintenance which comes from the administration end. How does a member in his own riding assess whether there has been good administration and clear-cut accounting for the operation of that project?

Let's take the original 1951 Roxborough Park project in Hamilton. I think the first house was built around 1951 and building proceeded on through the years under what was called the 50-year recovery programme. This was a fixed rental programme which had a lot of silly ramifications that we were able to overcome over the years.

At one time I asked for an accounting—the capital writeoff accounting—on that project. It took me a little better than a year to get it. I finally had to write, on advice from the department at that time, to the federal government—and after a series of letters back and forward I got a capital accounting. It was hard to understand.

I also asked for a maintenance accounting of one particular project, that Roxborough Park full recovery programme. Also after a lot of trying, I received a lot of papers trying to explain to me their maintenance programme. I didn't have the time, the ability, or the resources to analyse either one of the statements.

I think it is about time that we could have an accounting by reports to the House, or to the local areas, on what is the capital writeoff situation.

Take the Roxborough Park full recovery programme; it has been in operation now for 20 years. We want to know how it is making out. We want to know what happened to the capital investment and the capital writeoff situation in regard to selling some 526 of the homes. What benefit this related to the department or to the government. These are the kind of questions that start to arise in our minds with the housing programmes in this province.

I don't expect the minister will provide that information tonight, but I would like him to tell me how we will get that kind of satisfaction so we can look at a report that tells us what happened between the federal-provincial governments on the capital writeoff programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No problem at all. The hon. member doesn't have to say that.

Mr. Gisborn: Well you say it is no problem—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Be glad to get that for him.

Mr. Gisborn: —but I hope it doesn't take as long as it did the last time I requested the information.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That wasn't us.

Mr. Gisborn: How long ago? It's quite some time. Five or six years ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That wasn't us, because it was a federal-provincial matter.

Mr. Gisborn: Fine. But we shouldn't have to get up and appeal for this sort of thing. That should have been given to us in a report.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has the hon. member ever asked us for those figures he is asking for now? Has he ever asked Ontario Housing or the minister responsible for Ontario Housing?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, I made the appeal. And as I said, it took me some—

Mr. Sargent: You only answer things you want to answer.

Mr. Gisborn: —eight to 12 months to receive them, after writing to the federal government—getting their permission to have the capital writeoff accounting.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would be glad to get that information. I will provide it to the local housing area authority. And if the hon. member wants to be more specific about what he wants other than the general statements, we will get that for him as well.

Mr. Gisborn: If the chairman would consider my next point to be within the ambit of administration, I'll continue. That is the recent changeover in the administration in Hamilton. I don't know whether it is considered a drastic change in administrative procedures, but at least the functions have changed. There was an announcement that the government—the Ontario Housing Corp.—was going to take over completely the administration of both the family housing units and the senior citizens units. Previous to that announcement, I understand that the senior citizens' apartments were administered by the Hamilton Housing Co. and the family units were administered by the Hamilton Housing Authority directly under OHC.

At first, I came down on the side of the administration inasmuch as I thought they should be maintained in the hands of the provincial government, that is, the eventual decision. As the minister may know—if he doesn't he should—there was an appeal by the members of city council to leave the administration in the hands of the local municipality. After some thought, I have now come down on the side of that decision. I now feel that it would have been much better to have left the administration of both of these areas, the family units and the senior citizens units, in the hands of the municipalities.

My reasons are somewhat different from what I had thought were the reasons of Controller Turkstra and other members of the council, inasmuch as their argument enunciated a fact of more closeness, togetherness, and I analysed it to be political control of the use of the units. That has proved to be somewhat false and I think their argument has fallen apart.

I now feel that it would have been better left in the hands of the municipality if we could have had set up the kind of administrative body that I felt was necessary. I would ask the minister to tell me what decision has been made as to the administrative bodies in the sense of the appointments to the decision-makers in the operations?

I had some part in analysing the situation and taking an active part in what was going on in Hamilton with regard to housing with the Hamilton District Labour Council. We sent a letter to the hon. minister. I believe they received a reply. I wasn't that much interested whether he replied in the affirmative, adopting their recommendations in their entirety, or whether he answered in the sense that he would give them consideration.

I am going to put forward the ideas we had as to the administration of these bodies. Then the minister can tell me whether or not his department have made a decision and have appointed the two bodies to administer the senior citizens' apartments and the family units.

The letter to the minister asked him to recommend or to consider that the bodies have three members from the municipal council; one provincial MPP—over which I disagreed with the labour council but they felt it was necessary to have representation from an area—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I bet it's a Tory!

Mr. Gisborn: —two members from the tenants' representatives, one who should represent the family housing units and one representing senior citizens housing units; one member representing the Hamilton District Labour Council; and four members at large, to be citizens' members at large.

We felt that this would give the kind of representation and community togetherness that was necessary to see to it that we reduced, once and for all, the misunderstanding about the operations of public housing in a municipality. I would like to know what decision was made in regard to that.

I might say that the zone 14 council of the United Senior Citizens' Council of Ontario adopted the labour council's submission in this regard, with the rider that they have two members of the citizens' at large four members. The reason for this is that, over the past, and the years that I have had something to do with public housing in Hamilton, we have found just as much trouble finding out what the rights of the tenants were, what the rights of municipal councillors were, what the rights of MPPs were as to the operations, because of the makeup of the administration committees, which, I think, at that time were all citizen groups appointed by the provincial government. As I related before, they were usually made up of active real estate agents, other council agents, lawyers and people who all had a direct real estate interest. These were

the people who made up the councils of the housing authorities. We always felt that they had too much of the self-interest in what was going on in the housing field and that it didn't operate in a proper fashion. I think that that was corrected to some extent by continual badgering at the department in a direct way or in the House during the estimates.

Those are the questions that are raised under administration. Why was the decision made to take over the units and operate them directly from a provincial basis, rather than leave them in the hands of the municipalities? Have you appointed the committees for the two units, the senior citizen units and the family housing units? If you have, who are the personnel on the two bodies? What consideration did you give to the presentations made by the Hamilton District Labour Council and supported by zone 14 of the senior citizens' committee? Thirdly, can we have a capital accounting for the project and can we have an accounting on the maintenance programme that's operated in the project?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in respect of the comments the hon. member made about the Charney report, I don't know why the hon. member expected me to stand here and either defend the federal government as a result of what the Charney report said about the federal government—

Mr. Gisborn: I expected you to criticize it.

Mr. Lewis: It would have been a far more appropriate lead-off for you. Far more appropriate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was about to say that. I was about to say, or stand up here and criticize the federal government.

Mr. Deans: Why don't you do whatever you think is proper?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the first place, the report was an industry study, a general industry study only. As a matter of fact, it praised the innovative areas into which OHC has moved. It was not critical of OHC at all; it was really critical of the—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, yes, it was.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member can point out where it was and I would like to see it. As far as the federal government is concerned, I don't know why I should get up and attack the federal government. We would like to have more money from it, but we have had good co-operation from the federal government is respect of funds that we have been using that come from the federal government, its portion of the money which has been lent.

We could use more; but when one goes back over the history of it, in 1965 we used 79.6 per cent of all the funds the federal government made available to all of Canada. In 1966, we used 72.6 per cent; in 1967, 98.1 per cent and in 1968, 93.5 per cent. Those were years where the other provinces, particularly, made very little use of the federal funds. Ontario took advantage of everything it could get to build housing, and we did.

In 1969, there was 75.9 per cent and in 1970, 59.9 per cent. In 1971, we took 65.5 per cent of the funds—I am sorry. We took sufficient funds. These are the percentages of the housing of all Canada which we have built with the funds we received from the federal corporation.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, and you left $39 million in your budget that you did not use.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have gone into that before.

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean we have gone into that? You did not use that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just because the money wasn't spent in that year, the hon. member would suggest we do what they are criticizing the government for doing in some areas, suggest that if we don't spend the money, then throw it in holus bolus. We have commitments and that money will wait for the phases as they develop. We won't spend all the money we have this year; necessarily.

Mr. Lewis: Sure, you never spend.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, you don't order a contract and hand out a cheque, but you have to have the money there because you've made a contract and you pay it out.

Mr. Lewis: You will only spend it if there is a matching grant.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we'll go into that another time. I'm trying to get the answers to the hon. member for Hamilton East's questions. As far as the Hamilton situ-

ation is concerned, I am fairly familiar with that.

Mr. Martel: Tell us about Sudbury where you built half—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I dealt with the Hamilton people. The reason that OHC took this over was, in the first instance, because the Hamilton city council asked us to. And, subsequent to that—I don't know, six or seven months later—they got into a hassle within the council, and there was a division as to whether this was the right thing to do or not. Some of the members, at least one member, I recall, perhaps two, were concerned about whether we would give the same kind of local, personal community service that they felt was being given in Hamilton.

I met with them. They visited me in my office. I met with them. Even at that time, the mayor was all for, the OHC taking it over. We proceeded to do that. I went to Hamilton after that.

They've got brand new administrative offices for the local housing authority. Everyone, as far as we know, seems to be fairly satisfied with the situation as it is developing. I think some of the concerns one or two of the members of council had about the operation of it until it was taken over by OHC have, I think, by and large been dissipated. I think they are fairly happy with it. I can't say that they are all completely happy. I don't know that. But generally speaking the impression is that they like the way things are going.

Mr. Gisborn: The proof will be on how you appoint the committee.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pardon?

Mr. Gisborn: The proof will be on how you appoint the committee.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's already been appointed. There is an authority already appointed there. I don't know where the hon. member has been. How long ago were they appointed? I met them when I was out there, and that must have been a month ago. They have been appointed out there. It was announced in the papers. I'm sure there was an announcement.

Mr. Deans: The Hamilton Housing Authority?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, the housing authority, and the chairman is Mr. Ray Bissell. I think the hon. member knows him. There is a housewife, Mrs. Cousins, who is on it. There is a Mr. O'Neil, a union business agent, who is on the authority, and at the moment there is one vacancy.

Mr. Deans: That is the same one we have had all along.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is all right. The city council felt, those who were objecting to the takeover felt, it was in good hands then. All right, we've left it in the same hands except that we have taken over the operation of it, and it has helped them a great deal. We've given them new offices. We've given them all the co-operation of the facilities of the OHC. Now, I don't know why the hon. member is concerning himself with it, if it is running along smoothly.

Mr. Gisborn: But you have only given me three names.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If he has any complaints about it, if he has heard any complaints of any importance, I would like to hear about them.

Mr. Lewis: That is how you get your—

Mr. Gisborn: Will the minister send me a list of the two groups, the administrative groups on the two bodies? Mr. Bissell is an administrator in senior citizens apartments.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is the chairman, and there is one authority, handling the whole operation. There are no two groups there any more.

Mr. Gisborn: You are saying that one group administers both the senior citizens' and the family units?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Gisborn: Can I have a list of the committee?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, of course.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Chairman, you may not believe me but I assure you that I had a number of questions which I put together here, which are not provocative but which are designed to elicit certain answers from the minister.

Mr. Martel: He will find them provocative.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Let's hear them from the minister.

Mr. Givens: They are not confined necessarily to administration. Really, these three facets are interconnected—administration, rental housing and home ownership. I will ask them, and I'm sure that the chairman will guide me, as a young fellow from the city here trying to get ahead, as to what is right and what is wrong as far as the order is concerned.

But, before the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have all these questions asked, and I would like to have the answers, even though some of the answers may require a bit of work to get the figures.

I also want to make a couple of remarks about the opening address which the minister made tonight with respect to housing. As he could clearly see, I was irritated by some of the things that he said. It is all right for him to get up and read the speech, which obviously was not in his style and which was prepared for him—there is no objection to that—but then he gets up and reads the kind of lecture that he did about the advantages of public housing and about having tolerance with people, and reads the kind of speech that would be more properly be made at a prayer breakfast or a brotherhood meeting, to people on this side who are perfectly convinced about the need of public housing.

We know that 10 years ago if a minister got up in the time of George Drew and made the kind of speech he made today—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ten years ago?

Mr. Givens: —when they had to be dragged kicking and screaming—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ten years ago—in the time of George Drew?

Mr. Givens: Even up to 10 years ago from George Drew's time, they had to be dragged kicking and screaming—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Except that it is not 10 years ago—

Mr. Givens: Even up to 10 years ago from George Drew's time, if any minister like you would have got up to make the kind of speech you made today—all I can say is "O Tempora, O Mores".

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is 1972 remember.

Mr. Givens: Times have changed and you and your colleagues had to be dragged kicking and screaming into the 20th century to make the kind of housing speech that you made today. You weren't able to do all this with the assistance of the federal money that has been coming this way, notwithstanding the member for Hamilton East here, to whom you give very little credit except peripherally like you did just a few minutes ago.

And you, Mr. Minister, when you get up and make that reference—

Mr. Yakabuski: It is all Ontario money anyway. What are you talking about?

Mr. Givens: —obviously designed for me, about the Spadina Expressway—about how you protect it. How you brought that into this speech I'll never understand.

Mr. Lewis —urban core.

Mr. Givens: The viability of the urban core—

Mr. Turner: Urban what?

Mr. Givens: And you of all people can stand in the cabinet for three successive administrations and acquiesce at every turn of the way to every move that was made by your government to build the Spadina Expressway—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I had nothing to do with that—

Mr. Givens: And you cut across everything that has to do with housing. You cut a swath through Downsview and you cut a swath through the housing in York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Lewis: What a swathcutter you are.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Givens: But when your ox was beginning to be gored you said, "Stop it. Stop it. We have to move people instead of cars"—

Mr. Yakabuski: Don't worry about it. You never got anywhere in Ottawa either.

Mr. Givens: —and 700,000 cars and 100,000 trucks pour down past the housing of my area. And you have done nothing in the past year to—

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): What has this got to do with housing, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Givens: —protect the housing in my area.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: Rewarding you for what you did by protecting the integrity of the inner core would be like rewarding Lieutenant Calley, and making him a mayor of Hanoi because of what he did at My Lai.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, come on.

Mr. Givens: Well, you sat by and you saw this happen in Downsview and York-Forest-Hill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are getting worse —you are not getting better. Come on.

Mr. Lewis: I will concede that the parallel is not exact.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 804.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the way he goes.

Mr. Lewis: —for the first time.

Mr. Givens: For the first time I'd like to know—

Mr. Lewis: My hyperbole is not so hyperbolic.

Mr. Givens: Are you in control of this meeting, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I wonder.

Mr. Givens: I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, how much money is being spent looking at these administration estimates, on the purchase of security services from Community Guardians Ltd. I want to know how many OHC projects are covered by this company and I want to know how many man-hours are involved. Does the money come from salaries and wages which is shown here as $1.47 million? Or does it come from services, which is over $1.25 million?

Mr. Lewis: What is the name of the firm?

Mr. Givens: The name of the firm, as I found it to be, is Community Guardians Ltd. I understand they provide custodial services, and I would like to know what their function is as well.

The second question is, Mr. Minister, you provided—

Mr. Lewis: Chaperone.

Mr. Martel: Sounds like Driver Pool, Allan.

Mr. Givens: I gave you a lift yesterday. Why are you knocking me?

You provided $100,000 for research studies that I mentioned in my remarks on Tuesday. Can you briefly outline what these studies will deal with? And I'd like to know what firms or individuals will be conducting these studies.

I'd like to know, for instance, are you researching the question of the expropriation of legal non-conforming uses? I know that you know what that means; namely, as in the case of the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if I know it, don't tell me.

Mr. Givens: In the case of housing development that was aborted in Scarborough, you were accused by everybody here of doing the wrong thing by approving this development next to an asbestos plant. There are many illegal, non-conforming uses in Metropolitan Toronto.

Are you doing any research work with respect to the matter of expropriating these real, non-conforming, noxious land uses, instead of running away from them? Perhaps if you looked into this and provided the money for this kind of expropriation, it would obviate the necessity of running away from various areas where there happens to be a factory nearby that has been in existence legally for many many years; and can't be removed because of certain common law legal rights.

Now the third question is where is the money coming from for maintenance of OHC projects? Do you get it strictly from your rentals, which are geared to income? This means that if income is down, your rentals must be down. Where do you draw your maintenance money from, and how much will be spent on maintenance this year?

I would also like to know, by the way, if you are providing any money in your maintenance account for the maintenance of the houses that were expropriated for the Spadina expressway and rapid transit? I'd like to know how much there is. Various figures have appeared in the press. Are you providing the money for that, or is Metro? Is there joint management?

I have been unable to determine who really conducts the administration of those houses, most of which are in my area. These houses were expropriated and are now in limbo pending a decision on what's going to happen in the area. Do you maintain them at all? Do you provide money for it? Perhaps you should.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is the matter of recoveries of administrative expenses, which are outlined as $3,566,000 for rental housing and $1,078,600 for home ownership. Can you tell me exactly where this money is coming from, and are these accurate figures; or are they projected estimations on an optimistic basis?

Advances for housing projects are outlined as $23,566,000 for rental housing and $28,250,000 for home ownership. Can you describe in greater detail what these projects are? Then you've got $82,250,000, which is being disbursed for HOME. How many mortgages are involved? I'd like to know how many individual mortgages are involved; what the interest rate is—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you want all this tonight?

Mr. Turner: Right, within the hour.

Mr. Givens: No. You have got staff. They can do figures. It doesn't have to be tonight.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say I didn't have it.

Mr. Givens: I don't think there is anything irregular or unreasonable—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say it was irregular!

Mr. Givens: How much revenue will be forthcoming—

An hon. member: Now how would he know?

Mr. Givens: I don't expect him to know. I told him that. How much revenue will be forthcoming from the interest? Is this the seven per cent kind of interest rate that you are going to be charging on these mortgages?

Well, I'd like to know how much interest revenue will be coming from these mortgages. Incidentally, who does the legal work on these mortgages? Do you have your departmental lawyers, or do you retain outside services?

Now, the minister made reference in his remarks tonight about the number of homes that were available in 1971. He said 20,650 were started. How many new housing units will be started this year, and how many new housing units will be completed by the end of your fiscal year? And lastly, how many housing units—What's your fiscal year, when does it end?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Calendar year.

Mr. Givens: Can you estimate how many housing units will be built this year as compared to last year. Are you in a position to do that now, do you think?

What is the rate at which the construction of OHC units has increased over the past five years? I imagine it has increased from the figures that I have heard you give over various times.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Knowing what a good organization we are, you know we are going ahead.

Mr. Givens: I would like to know, s'il vous plaît. Thank you very much. Merci beaucoup.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has given me quite a notebook full. The staff who are here will attempt to get as much information as they can to give to him tonight if possible. I don't know whether they can get all of that.

There is one comment I would like to make, if my hon. friend will forgive me. I somewhat resent the idea that he suggests—that any kind of an approach on my part which is designed to show the progressive approach I have to social problems is unbecoming—is somewhat of an arrogance on his own part. I can remember those years in city council, dear old Phil, when you did a pretty good job of that yourself. You know all those crocodile tears which the Liberals usually shed on these matters.

I would like to ask the hon. member if there is so much more sincerity in these matters—they are not following the tenets of one George Drew and we are—there is so much sincerity on their part. I am sure that is what the hon. member is suggesting. During the discussion on the project which we are proposing to build in Scarborough East I don't know where he was. Why didn't he get up here on the floor of the House and say he thinks it's a shame that this government should forge ahead with this programme, because it was much-needed public housing?

Indeed that is what I asked of all the members of the opposition. When all that debate was going on and indeed that debate is going on in many of the boroughs of Metropolitan Toronto today, and I can tell the hon. member there are members—very prominent Liberal members and very prominent NDP members—on those councils

who come into the confines of my office and protest the building of public housing projects. They forget all about philosophies and everything else, they just say, "We don't want them here."

Mr. Lewis: Then they are wrong, and you will tell them so.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. The hon. member says they are wrong. I say they are wrong in most of those instances. What I am asking the hon. members is to stop playing that kind of politics, and get up publicly and ask their supporters in those boroughs to get up on the public platform and let the people know where they stand, and defend public housing projects.

Mr. Deans: What about all the Tories that come in to see you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are playing politics with it the same as everybody else.

Mr. Martel: That includes the Tories, does it, Allan?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I would think that it would be much more to the point if the hon. member got up on the floor of this House and said that he supports that. Indeed, I think that this is what he was referring to; it was a sort of indirect approach.

He asked me to find out whether, if I heard him correctly, whether we have studied the law relating to non-conforming use on that location. So I presume what he is driving at is that we should say, "Look, nobody can stop us. Forge ahead with it because it would be a non-conforming use." Indeed, it wouldn't even be a non-conforming use. Why doesn't he just get up and say, "Grossman, you order your people to go ahead with that Scarborough project and to hell with the objections out there"?

Mr. Givens: The minister sounds very, very sensitive. I was casting no aspersions. I was merely using the Scarborough matter as an incident when I asked the question as to what the $100,000 was being spent for on research studies. I asked whether, as part of these research studies, he was going to consider the question of the expropriation of legal non-conforming uses.

I cannot blame the minister or his department for moving away from that project and not building it because of the asbestos factory. What I am saying, without trying to cast any aspersions—merely as an example, so that people who aren't familiar with the term legal non-conforming uses will understand what is being talked about—namely, would you consider as part of your research the whole question—not only that particular project which was aborted but others of a similar nature—where there are noxious legal non-conforming uses that probably should be considered for expropriation instead of walking away from them?

I didn't mean to—I am repeating myself for the third time now—put any label of guilt on you for withdrawing from that particular project. There are these factors of noxious, legal, non-conforming uses. We've been turning our backs on them for many many years, both municipally and provincially.

I asked you what your research projects were. But I was merely suggesting in passing that one of the things you should look into is this matter of doing away with legal non-conforming uses in a provincial way, instead of in a local municipal way, which has certain injustices attached to it.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Could I ask, for purposes of continuity, why the minister can't answer virtually all the questions now? They were extremely straightforward.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Everybody doesn't have all of these at their fingertips. I'll answer them. I have a couple ready now.

Mr. Lewis: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have a couple ready now.

Mr. Lewis: You have a couple ready. Fine. Well, I would've assumed that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suggested that perhaps while I was waiting I could make some comment about the little jabs that my dear friend gave me—suggesting that I wasn't sincere in my concern over social problems. I think my record bears out that I am.

Mr. Lewis: Your record speaks for itself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Insofar as housing starts are concerned—are you talking about all of Ontario? Was my hon. friend referring to all of Ontario or Metro housing starts?

Interjection by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: I am interested in the whole of the thing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now the hon. member is learning.

In 1965, OHC starts were 1,194; in 1966, 2,929; in 1967, 7,092; in 1968, 4,905.

I am sure I don't have to tell the hon. member why there was a drop then. That was a dear friend he supported for the leadership of the Liberal Party, who wanted all housing stopped for a couple of years—

Mr. Lewis: Oh yeah, that was a fellow named Randall. That's who it is.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They are all concerned.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In 1969 it was 5,157; in 1970, 9,568, and in 1971, 11,430. Pretty good progress, I would say.

Mr. Martel: Far short of how many thousands—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mortgages are advanced by the Housing Corp. Ltd. at the rate of 8¾ per cent. That is for mortgage loans by us. Was that the question asked?

Mr. Givens: Well, that was the sixth one, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member asked about the Community Guardians.

Mr. Givens: I asked you how many mortgages there were—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we'll get that. We'll get as much as we can. We were trying to anticipate the hon. member's questions by having them ready in advance of the meeting today, but you can't anticipate everything.

The Community Guardians—What was the question you asked about that?

Mr. Givens: I asked you how much money is being spent on the purchase of security services for Community Guardians Ltd.; how many OHC projects are covered by this company; how many—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Eighteen projects. Is that the same company?

Mr. Givens: How many man-hours are involved?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me answer that one while I have it in front of me. Eighteen projects are covered. Go ahead.

Mr. Givens: How many man-hours are involved? Does the money come from salaries and wages or from services? You've got a lot of money under both items. A million and a half in one and a million and a quarter in the other.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Under services vote.

Mr. Givens: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Services.

Mr. Martel: Why don't you know these answers?

Mr. Givens: Why are there only 18 projects covered? Don't all your projects require security?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Because he is not in the position—

Mr. Martel: Just stalling for time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I want to put this as carefully as I can. These happen to be the 18 projects where it was felt that it would be advisable to use Community Guardians. There appeared to be some need there.

Mr. Givens: How many man-hours are involved in the 18 projects?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I may be able to get that for you.

Mr. Lewis: Ask him how much money?

Mr. Givens: The first question I ask, Mr. Minister, is how much money is being spent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are 2,200 man-hours.

Mr. Givens: There are 2,200 man-hours? How much money are you spending and under what account?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is $700,000 a year.

Mr. Givens: It is $700,000 for the 18 projects. What does that come out of, salaries and wages or services?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Services.

Mr. Givens: Services?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It comes out of rentals and subsidies. The federal government pays 50 per cent, we pay 42.5 per cent and the municipality pays 7.5 per cent.

Mr. Givens: For security.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Part of it.

Mr. Givens: It's a maintenance; a general maintenance.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Community Guardians. It comes under the operating budget. The operation of the units is financed in the same proportion.

Mr. Givens: All right, I want to make that clear. So, then, you are being advised that it comes out of operations; it does not come out of salaries and wages or services. You said it comes out of operations, so that means it doesn't come out of salaries and wages. It doesn't come out of services, so it is not shown under administration. It's not shown here at all. How do you account for it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member have the estimates book in front of him? It is on page 75, under rental housing, "Provincial share of property management subsidies, family and senior citizens' housing."

Mr. Given: The $24 million then.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The $24,151,000, and that is shared.

Mr. Givens: And $700,000 is the provincial share?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, $24,151,000 of that particular item is our share of the property management. Within that property management comes the cost of the Community Guardians.

Mr. Givens: Is the $700,000 part of the 50 per cent share that we pay into that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We pay 42.5 per cent. The federal government pays 50 per cent of the operating costs.

Mr. Givens: All right. So $700,000 is our 42.5 per cent, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's the total. That is 100 per cent of the cost. Our share of that would be 42.5 per cent.

Mr. Givens: Of $700,000?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's right.

Mr. Givens: That is the answer to the first question. Then there is $100,000 for research. What do you do in research? Who do you employ, individuals or the companies?

Mr. Lewis: They never spend it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is the OHC design competition, which is in the nature of research. We gave a grant to the Ontario Welfare Council. Did the hon. member ask for figures? We have a study of recreational facilities and termite control grants. We have staff planned in other areas such as building performance. We have a study on mother-led families, rental sales, surveys of need and demand—

Mr. Sargent: This is the first time you have seen that statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, it is.

Mr. Sargent: Yes. You've no idea what's going in there.

Mr. Givens: Talk to me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So far this is what I have been able to get—

Mr. Givens: You haven't looked into legal non-conforming uses?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Givens: Who does this research? Your own department or do you have firms or individuals—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. Obviously the design competitions are done by our department. We ran it. We ran the competition. We have given a grant to the welfare council for research. We have studied recreational facilities. That's been done by my own staff.

Mr. Givens: Who did you pay for the termites?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Termites was a grant to Metropolitan Toronto, of $20,000.

Mr. Givens: To Metro Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Apparently it's the only place with termites.

Mr. Chairman: Has the minister finished?

Mr. Givens: Where is the money for maintenance of the projects coming from? How much will be spent on maintenance? Is that part of the provincial share of property management?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Provincial share of property management subsidies, $24 million is our share.

Mr. Givens: And that share—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's 42.5 per cent.

Mr. Givens: Have you got a figure from that on how much you pay for maintenance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you want me to figure it out?

Mr. Givens: You know the hourly rates—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's $24 million, 42.5 per cent of it.

Mr. Givens: All right. Do you do anything for the maintenance of those Spadina houses or not? Are you—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We would have no connection with that at all. Why would we?

Mr. Givens: You were a 50 per cent partner in the acquisition of the land for the provincial government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. This hasn't come into the hands of OHC.

Mr. Givens: You don't manage that at all?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Givens: Nothing to do with it. All right. Four: The recovery of administrative expenses—from rental housing, $3.5 million; and home ownership, $1,078,000. Where does that money come from?

Where do those moneys come from, the $3.5 million and $1,078,000?

Mr. Sargent: He doesn't know the answers to anything.

Mr. Givens: Are those estimates or hard figures?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: OHC charges, for administrative expenses, $100 per unit capital cost to the projects; and for managing $9 per unit per month.

Mr. Givens: The $100 is non-recurring, the capital cost?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's right. That's capital.

Mr. Givens: And the $9 is recurring?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Monthly, per unit. That is charged to the project and therefore this is the share we receive back from the other two jurisdictions for that management.

Any more curves there?

Mr. Givens: You told me the interest rate on the mortgage is 8¾ per cent and I asked how many mortgages are involved. Who does the legal work on the mortgages?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Givens: How much revenue would be arising out of the interest?

Mr. Cassidy: It is refreshing to see the minister with stuff at his fingertips.

Mr. Lewis: You have not been housing minister for more than a few years have you? I mean you got the assessment branch five weeks ago and you have mastered it completely.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have been responsible for housing for just about a year.

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you resign?

Mr. Lewis: Is that all, just about a year? I remember that Throne Speech of yours.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It just sounds longer. That was last year which means that it's less than a year. It means about 11 months.

Mr. Lewis: About 11 months? Well, you started on—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member think he would have all this at his fingertips?

Mr. Lewis: I think so.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You do? We have 630 projects I think and some—

Mr. Deans: Stop apologizing and read the paper.

Mr. Lewis: Actually, don't worry about it. Relax.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, you know, I am very sensitive about this, because I think I should know everything. I just know most things.

Mr. Lewis: That's true.

Mr. Deans: We just haven't hit on anything you know yet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You just happened to hit on one of them.

Mr. Givens: How many mortgages?

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is just filled with trivia about his programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In 1971-1972-1973 we will have 20,049 mortgages; 9,900 under the condominiums, which were committed prior to 1972-1973; and 1,047 under the HOME lots. Under the guaranteed programme, 3,484

condominiums, 1,064 HOME lots. under proposed and anticipated new condominiums, 2,959; and 1,595 HOME lots. The staff lawyers look after home lots. We appoint lawyers for the condominiums. Under the guaranteed programme, where we only guarantee the loans, the lenders provide the legal work.

Mr. Givens: By the way, on all these mortgages, what has been your foreclosure rate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: None so far.

Mr. Givens: None?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Sorry to disappoint you.

Mr. Givens: No, I am not disappointed, but apropos what the minister was saying to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce about the provincial offices; what happens when you make wrong decisions? You apparently haven't been making any wrong decisions. You are batting a thousand!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So far we have not made any wrong decisions.

Mr. Givens: You are great!

All right, now how many—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Correction.

Mr. Givens: You know, that's hard to believe, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There have been five since last year.

Mr. Givens: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Five.

Mr. Givens: Five individual foreclosure actions; and that's all out of the whole shooting match.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right. Great organization!

Mr. Givens: Perhaps the question I should have asked is, how many are in default? What's your default rate? You may not issue foreclosure proceedings; but there are probably many that are in default. What I really want to know is what is the failure rate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Combined first and second mortgages in arrear, 1.72 per cent.

Mr. Cassidy: That's pretty safe, you know. You are lending too much to the middle income group; and not taking any risks.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So we are wrong there, too. We will try and have some more failures.

Mr. Cassidy: That is his comment. He is worried about defaults.

Mr. Givens: No, I think this just proves that you are not going low enough on the income scale; that you could afford to be, you know, "more brave."

Mr. Lewis: Yes. The lower you go the more defaults you will have. You know these low-income earners.

Mr. Givens: No, but he may think that there is a risk. He can afford to take the risk. All right, how many new housing units are you projecting for this year?

Mr. Martel: Now, don't be to boisterous. Remember last year, Al.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It looks like about 17,000.

Mr. Givens: How many?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About 16,000 to 17,000.

Mr. Givens: Well that's less than you said you had for last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Givens: Why is that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Various reasons. Some of the reasons the hon. member has seen. We can't get some of them built where we would like to have them built. There was a mortgage situation every short while. We have taken a great deal of the money and put a spurt on this year because it was needed. We are using some of that money this year, and condominiums have taken up a great deal of it as well.

Mr. Lewis: People don't need housing as much any more. You can tell from what you are giving.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The demand isn't as great as it was last year, if that's what the hon. member—

Mr. Lewis: Isn't as great? Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sure the hon. member is ready to deal with that a little later, and I want to deal with it too.

Mr. Lewis: Well, not until next week.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right.

Mr. Givens: All right, finally: What is the rate at which the construction of OHC units has increased over the past five years? What has been, relatively, your rate of growth?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, I can't—

Mr. Givens: What has been your rate of growth over your past five years annually?

Mr. Cassidy: It is a negative rate now.

Mr. Givens: Well, you read off figures before in which you have increased—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are looking for a projection, are you?

Mr. Givens: Which you have increased every year. Now this year you are going to go down, for the reasons that you have indicated, whether they are acceptable or not. Would you just tell me what your average rate of growth is over the past five years in the construction of housing units?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me figure that out for you. Last year if you recall, in fact I made the statement here and I had it in the figures when I mentioned last year's was 25 per cent over the previous year, but if you are looking for an average over the years, we'll have to calculate that for you. I don't know what that is going to prove, but we will be glad to get it for the hon. member.

Incidentally, I should point out that the vacancy rate of apartment rentals this year was higher than it was last year.

Mr. Lewis: Then why don't you use your rent subsidy programmes that you are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We can't use the rent subsidy programme if the landlord won't rent us his premises.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I see.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We attempted to get them all out last year, we didn't get all we were entitled to, we were—

Mr. Lewis: You know you are hard pressed; you can't get your money; you can't rent apartments—it is a wonder you do anything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All we can do is build thousands and thousands of units.

Mr. Lewis: Oh I know, 68,000 in six years. You see I mastered it.

Mr. Deans: I want to speak to the minister about the general administration of the housing programme, but I want to speak in particular about the rental of accommodation; the manner in which rents are set; the amounts of rents; and the difficulties that people are having in trying to find the money to pay the rents that are being set by this department.

In the general philosophy about the rental structure—

Mr. Chairman: That would generally fall under item 2.

Mr. Deans: No, it wouldn't really because it is not about the units themselves, but rather about the philosophy of the department in regard to the application of the rental structure. It is nothing to do with the units and their adequacy.

I want to begin by pointing out to the minister, as an example, that in the city of Hamilton, about nine years ago, eight years ago perhaps, you built some houses on the mountain in an area called, I think, Berrysfield Gardens. It is immediately adjacent to where I live, and I am happy that they are there. I want to get that on the record to begin with. I didn't object to them being put there; I am happy they are there.

But at the time those homes were built they were built for about the same price as the house that I bought. I bought a house; those homes were built for rental purposes. It may have been seven years ago, I don't know the exact number of years, but since the time that the homes were built, my cost to maintain my home, in principal and interest, has gone from about $112.65 a month to $130 a month.

The rental for those accommodations has gone from $120 a month, in some instances, to, in the case of one family that I am about to talk about, $207 a month.

Now during that interval my personal income has increased considerably more than theirs—I was lucky they supported me!—I, in fact, am talking to you now about the practical application of your rent-geared-to-income programme.

To begin with, as I understand the programme, the programme was intended to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member tell me, before we proceed, so we can make some calculations here. If a person is paying $170 a month what is his income?

Mr. Deans: One hundred and seventy dollars? I said $207.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did you say $270?

Mr. Deans: I said $207—two, zero, seven, and he earned about $8,400; I can't recall the exact figure, it may have been $8,700. It doesn't matter. At this point I am not talking about that because I want to come to that in a minute.

I want to first of all talk with you about the whole problem of what you are doing. The purpose of the homes apparently was to provide temporary accommodation for people while they were to amass a small fortune to buy a home of their own, and it is a small fortune that you need these days to buy a home of your own. When they moved in there—and I'm using a hypothetical couple for the moment—perhaps they earned about $6,000 a year, maybe less. They would pay on $6,000 a year about $1,500 in rent, about 25 per cent of their income. This is $125 a month by my calculation or approximately that much. If in any given year, their income went from $6,000 to $8,000 as a result of overtime, increase in wages, change of job, you name it, their rents would go from $1,500 to $2,160 approximately—and again you can correct me for the sake of a few cents—which is about $180 a month.

In actual fact, although their gross income would increase by $2,000, their net income would increase by about $1,400. Their rent would increase by about $660, which would mean that in terms of expendable increase of income, they would have $740 left of their $2,000 increase. But, at that point, their rental is considerable; their opportunity to save is almost eliminated and these people have very little opportunity from that point on to put away sufficient money. Recognizing that you need between $6,000 and $8,000 just for the downpayment, these people would have little if any opportunity of ever saving the $6,000 to $8,000 that they need.

Throughout the area of rent-geared-to-income homes, we are finding this is what is happening. On paper the amount of 25 to 30 per cent that is being charged appears to be reasonable, but when you start to talk about it in terms of expendable income, you are taking a considerable chunk more than the 25, 28, 29 or 30 per cent the government talks about, and you are working a tremendous hardship on these people.

These people would like to own a home of their own. At the time that they rented from Ontario Housing, they were told by the people who rented them the house—and this can be proved by a document—that it would be likely within the next five years they would have an opportunity to purchase the house. They didn't get that opportunity. It has been explained to me on previous estimates that it is not the intention of the department to sell the house to the people. Unfortunately, these people are being gouged, because if they do have three children there is no other accommodation that they can get. It is not that they can't afford to pay the rent; it is that there is nothing for them. Once get into Ontario Housing accommodation and the rent continues to escalate on a year-to-year basis far in excess of the increase in their expendable income or the proportional increase in the expendable income, these people come more and more under the gun.

When they get to point of paying $207 a month in rental, as this one family has at this point, they can't afford to move. They can't afford to stay there and they can't afford to move, because there is no place for them to go, and there is no way for them to save the money to buy a house. There is no way for them to get alternative accommodation, and these people are finding it extremely difficult.

I want to suggest something to the minister, because I think his programme is working a hardship on many of the middle-income people who have been lured into the Ontario Housing Corp. houses. They go in there at a time when their income is lower but when the income rises by whatever proportion it does, their expendable income rises by a considerably lesser proportion.

As the gap between what they did earn and what they now earn widens, their expendable income becomes greater, but the actual amount they realize on every dollar increase is considerably less. Yet, the amount taken from them in percentage of their gross income goes up. So, at one point, if you take a person earning $1,000 more than he had last year, he will pay, instead of 25 per cent of his income, 27 per cent of his income perhaps.

The unfortunate part is that that $1,000 doesn't realize $1,000 for him. So, 25 per cent of the $1,000 goes to Ontario Housing, but unfortunately because his income rises and because of the income tax structure, he gets considerably less of his income with each increase.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Everybody does.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services) Don't you?

Mr. Deans: Everybody does, except in your case and in my case, my costs to maintain

my home don't rise in proportion to my income. My cost doesn't rise in proportion to my income. My cost doesn't rise in proportion to my income. It rises in proportion to the cost of maintaining the home.

When you talk about subsidized housing, I say to you right now that there is no such thing as subsidized housing, that, in fact, all you are talking about is that you amortized the cost of the unit over an extended period of time; that instead of realizing the full return in 30 years, it may take 50 years to realize the full return on any home. But you are not subsidizing it. All that is happening is that they are paying less on a yearly basis. It is not being subsidized at all, because eventually the amount that you receive by way of rental for the majority of homes does pay off the cost of the mortgage.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Never.

Mr. Deans: Oh, come on? Do you mean to tell me that you don't think the $207 that that family is paying for the house that cost Ontario Housing $14,800 is not sufficient to pay off the mortgage?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Never.

Mr. Lewis: That is a self-liquidating project.

Mr. Deans: It's absolute nonsense to say otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's nonsense. The hon. member—

Mr. Deans: It's not nonsense and sit down. Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You're suggesting everybody's paying $207 a month. What nonsense!

Mr. Deans: I'm telling you that they are paying $207 a month.

Hon. Mr. Snow: How many?

Mr. Deans: I'm telling you they are paying $207 a month.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, but that is one person you are talking about.

Mr. Deans: I'm telling you that you have people in the same neighbourhood who are paying $190 a month.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, go ahead with it.

Mr. Deans: This is the attitude of the minister. This is exactly the attitude of the minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We'll tell you—

Mr. Deans: This sort of "slough it off, who cares?" grin all over your face. This is what I resent about this ministry, because they don't seem to understand the impact of their stupid policies on the people of the province. And this is why I feel, quite frankly, that it's time that you went out into the field and saw what is happening. You may sit at Queen's Park all of your life but you will never understand the effect of your policies unless you go and speak to these people in those subdivisions, not go around in a great tour. I don't mean arrive with all your aides wandering around patting babies' heads and chucking kids' chins.

Mr. Lewis: At election time.

Mr. Deans: I'm talking about going out when you are by yourself and sitting in their livingrooms and talking about what it costs them to live. This isn't being done by you or any other minister. This is what is wrong with the government.

The problem that you have at this point I say to you is this, that those people are not only paying for that home, they are paying for the next-door home perhaps, or a home five miles away, or a home 10 or 15 miles away, or perhaps a home in another city. They are being penalized. They are being penalized by the government for being industrious, instead of being helped by the government.

This is the aggravation of it. That when these people attempt to better themselves, as many of them are doing, they can't get the opportunity, because this government won't give them the opportunity.

I want to suggest to you what you could do as a reasonable way to deal with a situation such as this. If you believe, as you obviously do, that when people earn $8,000 a year in Hamilton they can then go out and find accommodation alternative to that which is provided by Ontario Housing, if you believe it is possible for them to live in self-contained, purchased accommodation, then why don't you institute a programme so that when most people get to the level of $8,000 or $8,500 they go on a priority list in order that they can then be allocated first oppor-

tunity for Home Ownership Made Easy programme homes in the area in which they live in at a repayment mortgage base no higher than the payments they are presently making, without a downpayment?

Why don't you go to these people and say to them: "We need this home for someone who earns considerably less than you. But we are prepared to make available for you a home that is being built under the HOME programme that you can go into and continue to pay the 25, or 27, or 28, or 29 or 30 per cent that you presently pay," and let them, without any downpayment at all, move from the Ontario Housing rental unit into a purchased situation in the new subdivision?

Why can't you do that? What's wrong with that for a scheme to get those people out of the rental units?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): They never had the imagination to think of it, that's what is wrong.

Mr. Deans: Then, from that point on, the only addition to the cost of maintaining that home would be, in effect, any increase in taxes or maintenance costs, and that would be borne by the owner. Now, what in heaven's name is wrong with instituting that kind of programme, going out into those subdivisions and talking to those people about making that opportunity available to them, rather than locking them in? They'll never save the downpayment. I don't care if you make the downpayment $500, the majority of those people are not in a position to save it.

But they certainly have proven by their living in that accommodation over a number of years, most of them, their interest in maintaining it in a reasonable fashion; their interest in paying the rent on time; their interest in maintaining a decent place for their families to live. And it is beholden upon you to think of some of the ways to get those people out of that accommodation and into accommodation of their own.

I would like to hear from the minister why it is that such a programme couldn't be worked, because I can see no reason why it can't be worked. I think that for the majority of people who live in the subdivision that I mentioned initially—and, I suspect in almost any subdivision you want to look at across the Province of Ontario—that if you made this kind of offer to them, by far the majority of people would accept.

So it means amortizing over 50 years. That is a damn sight better than paying rent over 50 years and having nothing at the end to show for it. It is a lot better than paying rent for those years to the Ontario Housing Corp., and having the Ontario Housing Corp. raising the rent every single year that they are there—in accordance with either their increase in pay, which they have worked hard to get, or overtime payments, which, in fact, come infrequently, or the industry that they show by doing some additional work outside.

I would like to know from the minister what he is prepared to do about that, because you are shackling the people who I am talking about. You are in fact making it virtually impossible for these people ever to acquire for themselves their own accommodation. And you make it increasingly more difficult every year you raise the rent and maintain this ridiculous geared-to-income programme that you have got.

You have no business talking about it in terms of subsidized housing, because what actually happens is that the people who live in the housing unit next door subsidize the ones beside them instead of the community as a whole being subsidized. Over the course of a considerable period of years—and I don't care how many—but over the course of a considerable period of years, that home is paid for out of the rental that you receive. There is no question about that.

Over the course of 10 years, from the time it is first rented to a point 10 years later, regardless of what you do with the rental, if those people remain in that home during that period, and if, as most do, there are periodic increases in their salary, there is no question that by the time that home is 10 years old most people will be paying an adequate amount by way of rental to cover the cost of the mortgage of that home at that time. And as you go through to the end of the 40th and 50th year they are paying four and five times what it actually cost by way of mortgage payments at the time that the house was first built.

There is nobody going to convince me that any home in that subdivision should have increased by way of rental to the amount that it has in the last five, six, or seven years. I would like to hear from the minister why it is they can't institute a programme similar to the one that I am asking for?

Mr. Chairman: Would the minister care to comment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member could have very well made his last point, which was the only point he

really made—it is a very valid point—without getting into a lot of figures which are misleading.

Mr. Deans: They are not misleading.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I sat here and listened to him. I just listened. He didn't have to suggest that I should get out of my Queen's Park Office and go out and visit with the people. I have done that many more times than he has, and long before I got into the government. Indeed I was born in that kind of an atmosphere.

Mr. Deans: Well, it has not rubbed off.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was brought up in the kind of poverty he never knew, and never, never will know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I know all about the concerns of people who don't have funds.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm not even talking about people who are earning $9,000 and $10,000, who is he talking about.

Mr. Deans: I am talking about people who have to go to other—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are talking about people. I am talking living with a family who never saw $9,000 or $10,000 for 25 or 30 years. Anyway, there was no need for that.

Mr. Deans: Let's hear it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member brings up one case where they are paying $207 a month rent—

Mr. Deans: I will give you more.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and attempts to leave the impression that we are getting $207 a month from many tenants and therefore we are making a lot of money on the deal. He is talking about someone who is earning almost, if not, $10,000 a year, because the maximum rent they can pay is 25 per cent of their income. And 25 per cent of their income means that if they are paying $207 a month rent, they are earning $828 a month. That's what they would have to earn to pay $207 a month rent.

We have people like that living in public housing, and we don't push them out. But that's not what public housing was designed for. Indeed, if we talk too much about this, we are going to get more antagonism from a portion of the public who say, "Why should you be subsidizing people at $100 a month and build these places for people who are making $9,000 and $10,000 a year?"

Mr. Deans: You're not subsidizing these people. Don't give me any of your rot!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now just a moment—if the hon. member will just listen to me. If these people's earnings rise, their rent is going to rise, because it's geared to income.

Mr. Deans: But you are not subsidizing these people?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We don't throw them out. If they want to stay there, fine. As a matter of fact, we like to have a good mix in the housing, and a good range of income is very helpful for a good community. On the other hand, we also would like to know that people who begin to get into that range will start looking for places in the private market.

Mr. Deans: They can't. You won't let them save.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right, I am leading up to that. The hon. member pointed out, as a matter of fact, that even in Hamilton, I think, he can find that he can buy houses for $16,000 and $17,000 with a downpayment of $822 dollars.

Mr. Deans: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, you can! You can get into some houses, you can get into condominiums and that sort of thing; you can get them. In fact, you can get into some condominiums without any downpayment.

Mr. Deans: And a second mortgage!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member knows they have been advertising—

Mr. Singer: Are you claiming credit for that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now just a moment, just a moment—

Mr. Deans: And you are talking about a second mortgage!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course they are; and they are hung on some of our HOME lots.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on. You know condominiums are in trouble today. That's why they are selling them without any down payments.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who do you think helped to finance some of those condominiums? We did.

Mr. Singer: To your sorrow.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it's helping the market. However, let's get back to this family that is paying $207 a month rent. The hon. member had a good—

Mr. Singer: Let's get back—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are going to be in trouble tonight, I can see that. We are attempting to have a logical and an intelligent discussion; if the hon. member wants his turn, he will have it. Just let us pursue this, if we may.

Mr. Singer: You are so—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. Let the minister reply to the hon. member for Wentworth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member had a good point when he suggested we should find a plan—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Come on, Vern, you know better.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and he suggested the kind of plan—to get these people into their own housing without a down payment. He is quite right, and this is precisely the kind of plan we are working on and are going to discuss with the federal government. And even if the federal government does not go along with the plan, we are hoping that we will be able to proceed with a plan of this nature.

It's a good point. He should have stayed on that point; he should have started with it and finished with it.

But I want to make it quite clear that nobody pays more than 25 per cent of their income in public housing. Indeed, the project the hon. member is talking about had to be subsidized to the extent of over $92,000 in 1972. Now, of course, he is making the point that you don't subsidize that particular family.

Mr. Deans: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know that we don't, even at $207.

Mr. Deans: Impossible!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe not. Maybe not. That may be. But he had a point, a good point, and this is a plan—

Mr. Deans: In rental—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —that should be started and expanded as far as it is possible to get some of these people to go into their own home under home ownership, because there is nothing better for a society than people owning their own homes. It is somethat we are going to pursue.

Mr. Deans: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Deans: Now wait a minute. I want to finish it.

Mr. Chairman: You are not finished?

Mr. Deans: Don't get jumpy. I want to ask the minister, how long do you anticipate waiting until you decide whether the federal government is going to participate or not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I don't think it will be very long at all.

Mr. Deans: Okay. You are in the process now. You have broken ground; you are putting in the storm sewers and all of the other facilities in this other subdivision immediately adjacent to the one I was talking about. It is under the Home Ownership Made Easy programme.

Will you ask the Ontario Housing officials to canvass the people in the area and put such a proposition to them?

Are you in a position to say that you will canvass the people in that area and put the proposition to them that they can have, in the new subdivision, a home of their own under the programme that I'm suggesting?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will have to give that consideration. I don't want to give an 'off-the-cuff' answer to that. There may be some implications to that, which, at the moment I'm not aware of.

Mr. Singer: Time to get a new minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There may very well be some elements of unfairness in giving a special advantage to somebody who is already housed, as against people who perhaps need housing more. I don't know. I

will certainly look at this and if it appears to be a feasible thing we'll do it.

Mr. Deans: I just want to pursue it, to make sure we fully understand. If you take a person out of the Ontario Housing rental units that obviously makes those rental units available for someone of lower income. If you decide, as I think you have, that between $8,000 and $8,500 is about the maximum amount that you will permit a person—not permit, but that you would like a person to earn and still live in rental units—what I really would like to see is some immediate consideration give them in the home ownership programme. You're building in and around Hamilton on a day-to-day basis; you have a large subdivision there; you have another just a stone's throw away; you have one in the east end of the city going in right now. I would like to see the Ontario Housing Corp. say to the people in those subdivisions; "If you would like to pay the same rent as you now pay you can move into a home and you will then build equity in the home." It may take a long time, but nevertheless.

When could I expect an answer, because I'd like to see it done before too long, if it's going to be done? If it isn't, then I've got to pursue another avenue.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'll give the hon. member that answer: I will give him an answer before too long. That's what he asked.

Mr. Singer: Oh, you can have comfort in that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions here with regard to administration. We have, I understand, $100,000 in the budget for that. I'd like to ask the minister, in his research has he gone into the modular housing concept that we talked about so much last year? Have we come up with some answers to use modular housing to give us low cost housing for low income groups? Has the minister—do you want to answer these individually, or what?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, as far as modular housing is—

Hon. Mr. Snow: Let's have the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —concerned, I must tell the hon. member we haven't met with too much success. I think I answer that to the hon. member last year, that systems—

Mr. Sargent: But you were going to embark on a very brave programme on that last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —systems building, by and large, hasn't been the success here that it has been in other places. Because, and in the view of the experts, the people who know, they have said that the construction industry, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, has got to about as efficient a stage as you could possibly get with present day knowledge.

Mr. Sargent: They went bankrupt.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who did? Who did?

Mr. Sargent: Systems.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is just confirming what I said.

Mr. Sargent: No, no. In the States it's a flourishing business. This is corrupt management. They took $3 million out of public funds.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, now, no. Take it easy. Corrupt management!

Mr. Sargent: You must know that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It just wasn't a success—

Mr. Sargent: Well, they milked the public.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because systems building hasn't been a success here, because the construction industry has been so highly efficient that they've got the cost of building just about as fine as you can get it, and systems building has been no help.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you're a great stick handler—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You just said my skates were dull.

Mr. Sargent: —but the very fact that this modular concept is the biggest growth industry in the United States and Canada—and this is American—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because their construction industry hasn't been as efficient as the construction industry is in this neck of the woods. It's as simple as that.

Mr. Sargent: That is the answer to give us housing for low income groups. It's the only

answer. Now, I ask you again then—has your research told you this?—why in this province, under your administration, has the cost for an OHC highrise unit is $17,900—almost $18,000 per unit—as against the cost of $14,000 for CMHC? What does your research tell you there? What is the reason for that? Why the spread of $5,000 per unit? Does your research tell you why we had 15,000 building contractors in Ontario and we had a total of 443 projects since the inception of OHC and 76 of these were built by friends of Mr. Clow, your bossman there, by Headway Construction—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: —and 76 of 446 contracts were let to one firm up in Thunder Bay. What does your research tell you? Is that an accident—that 15,000 builders are sitting here and one firm in Thunder Bay, friends of Mr. Clow, gets 76 contracts; or about 20 per cent of all the contracts let in Ontario are to friends of his? What does your research tell you there?

These are things that we have to know about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You made that speech last year.

Mr. Sargent: No, I didn't make that speech last year. I want to know what your research tells us. Why do these things happen?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They didn't happen.

Mr. Sargent: Is it just an accident that all the smart men come from Thunder Bay, that the head of the Ontario Housing Corp. is from Thunder Bay and—

Hon. Mr. Snow: From Halton East.

Mr. Sargent: —his buddies get all the contracts in multimillion dollars and 15,000 builders look out the window?

Mr. Lewis: If you laid it to rest, the body is being exhumed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It sure is.

Mr. Sargent: Does your research tell you, sir—

Mr. Cassidy: That is a Liberal research—

Mr. Sargent: —about Ottawa? I was there two days ago to see 600 units of steel houses of an outfit called Quadrex. They build these three bedroom houses, approved by CMHC, for $10,900. Pepole can get in there with a $500 downpayment and $115 a month. Are you doing that in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Where are you doing it?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): In Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Not in Owen Sound anyway.

Mr. Cassidy: You are coming along, Mr. Minister. That was a very quick answer.

Mr. Sargent: I want to know what you are doing about the concept of the Quadrex concept.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member through with all his questions?

Mr. Sargent: I don't know. Let's just see if you know what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Don't you know, if you are through?

Mr. Sargent: I know. I have seen this thing, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Don't you know? Mr. Chairman, I hate to waste the time of the House but really the hon. member has raised that chestnut again. He's read from Mr Bagnell's column. I took him to task earlier for the fact that he quoted from the column and he didn't have the courtesy to quote from the answer which was published in the Globe and Mail. So I'll have to do it all over again in front of a captive audience.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, because we had a bit of repetition, because we asked them embarrassing, things they don't want to face up to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am facing up to it. I'm going to give him the answer—a repetitious answer to a repetitious question. If the hon. member will give me a chance, I'll answer his question about the alleged difference of the cost of housing, and so forth. I'll just quote from the letter which I wrote to the Globe and Mail in answer to Mr. Bagnell's statement which was—

Mr. Sargent: We all read that letter.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —which was a resurrection from the hon. member's statement here in the House last year and was completely without foundation.

Mr. Sargent: The devil can quote scriptures to his own satisfaction.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'll read it again:

In June and July of last year these allegations on the proposal method were fully answered in the Legislature and would be available to Mr. Bagnell in his research and extended beyond Globe and Mail clippings to a reading of Hansard.

Mr. Sargent: Who cares?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue:

I will therefore deal with only some of the specific points raised [and it has to do with the question the hon. member repeated again]. Mr. Bagnell states, in practice, the OHC system has proven to be costly, for in North York an OHC high-rise costs $17,957 per unit which a similar building put up by CMHC costs only $14,371 per unit.

First of all, the OHC building in question is in York, not North York, and no similar building was in fact put up by CMHC. The building in York was first offered to CMHC for $14,371 a unit under the federal limited dividend programme and was referred by CMHC to OHC for consideration as a public housing project. To bring it up to OHC's higher standards —double glazing on windows, copper pipes and the like—and to cover higher wages under our fair wage clause [the hon. member mentioned that before, and CMHC doesn't have that] not required under the federal limited dividend programme, the cost per unit rose to $15,200. In arriving at the all-in costs, OHC includes legal fees, interest charges during construction, administration fees and the cost of stoves and refrigerators, with the result that the all-in cost was $16,319 per unit. In other words [this can sink in to the hon. member] the building constructed for OHC was a superior product to the one offered by CHMC and the per-unit costs reflected a number of charges on items not included in the $14,371. Mr. Bagnell's allegations that the cost to OHC was $17,957 per unit is completely erroneous anyway.

Mr. Sargent: I didn't want to know that much about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The all-in cost was $16,319. Let me finish up again. We were taken to task earlier when the hon. members opposite thought that some contractors—

Mr. Sargent: Why does Headway—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —some contractors for maintenance were underpaying their help—

Mr. Sargent: Why does Headway—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We pointed out that there is a fair wage clause in our contract. CMHC doesn't have that and therefore the building they are going to put up—there is a great element in the cost which has to do with fair wages in our contracts.

Mr. Sargent: Your motivation should be to get them up and not build monuments.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member is not satisfied with that explanation, perhaps we can continue the debate until it is clear in his mind, so he doesn't bother this Legislature two or three times a year with the same old chestnut which should have been laid to rest and buried at least a year ago.

Mr. Sargent: Well, isn't that just—

Mr. Chairman, I have never once in this Legislature mentioned Headway Construction. This is the first time I ever have.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are kidding.

Mr. Sargent: The member for Sarnia brought the Headway Construction matter up in the estimates last year. I have never yet mentioned Headway Construction.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, Eric Malling brought it up in the Toronto Star.

Mr. Sargent: That's right. So don't you give me that nonsense of yours, Mr. Minister. We are fed up with your double-talk. You tell me why, Mr. Minister, Headway gets 76 of the 400 contracts? Why do they get it? Tell me that, will you please?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That has also, Mr. Chairman, been raised in the House on numerous occasions.

Mr. Sargent: I don't care how many times it has been raised. I am asking you now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In 1970, Headway submitted 48 proposals for 2,047 units. However, of these, seven contracts were awarded for a total of 150 units. In 1971, Headway submitted 59 proposals for 3,466 units in 43 municipalities. However, of these, 14 contracts were awarded for a total of 772 units in the same year.

Will the hon. member please cut that out of Hansard when it is printed and stick it on

his desk so he'll have it in front of him and won't repeat it again?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister then tell me why—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: —he thinks there is nothing curious about the fact that Mr. Clow, a plumbing contractor by background, I understand—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That was also discussed.

Mr. Sargent: I don't know! I never talked about it. I want to find out—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member was probably not listening.

Mr. Sargent: I want to know—does he find it odd that the firm of a friend of his, out of 15,000 contractors in Ontario, gets 20 per cent of the business? Will you tell me, isn't that odd in your mind, that one from Thunder Bay should get that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not odd in my mind at all. I am sure there are many contractors who get business from OHC who are friends of the hon. members. I don't see anything wrong with that at all. The hon. member knows this was discussed in committee last year and we thrashed it over for about three hours—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and we gave him all of the facts—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and the suggestion that there was something improper about what Mr. Clow had done is really not worthy of a member in this House—

Mr. Sargent: I see. Okay.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and I don't think I'll bother answering that any longer. I mean, we're taking up the time of the members of this House who want to discuss something more important in housing.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury. Are you finished?

Mr. Sargent: One more question.

Mr. Chairman: One more question?

Mr. Sargent: Or two or three, I mean if I want to.

Mr. Chairman: Proceed.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the minister, are you still doing business with Headway Construction?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I recall seeing Headway Construction's name on some of the bids and some of the tenders. I am sure that they are still in business. I don't know whether they actually got any contracts or not. I rather imagine they do. They are a pretty busy company.

Mr. Sargent: How many contracts are we involved in with them right now, sir?

An hon. member: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce isn't finished.

Mr. Sargent: I am waiting for an answer.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. Let the member for Grey-Bruce finish.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Contracts which have been awarded—some of these are not signed to date but they have been awarded by OHC by the board of directors; 10 locations, two projects in one location.

Mr. Sargent: So you are currently involved in 10 projects. And how much money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't have that. They are involved in 556 family houses and units, and 252 senior citizen units.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I have an apology to make to the neighbouring caucus because I misinformed the House. I suggested that Mr. Sargent got his information—the research material—from the research department of the Liberal Party. In fact, his material, I am informed, is independent of the service provided by the Liberal caucus research on all occasions, and I do apologize to the House.

Mr. Singer: Very clever.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: You had better be careful. The man is intimidating you, shaking his fist at the chairman. That really bothers me.

Mr. Chairman: That is just a friendly wave, in the Chair's opinion.

Mr. Lewis: That is the way the Tories greet each other—with the clenched fist.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Different meaning though.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Martel: Some months ago I asked the minister if he concurred with the policy adopted by the Sudbury Housing Authority with respect to excluding anyone outside of the city of Sudbury from obtaining a housing unit under the Sudbury Housing Authority. The Minister concurred with that policy. You can check Hansard, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You just can't explain it. I did not concur.

Mr. Martel: You concurred with it by your willingness to accept it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh now, come on.

Mr. Martel: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will listen patiently to the minister when he replies, I would urge that he listen patiently to me.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Exactly.

Mr. Martel: And then maybe the minister would see the light.

Would the minister not agree, in view of the fact that the federal government puts in about 90 per cent of the money for housing units and the Ontario government about 10, that in fact the only criterion for a house under the Sudbury Housing Authority should be based on need and not whether you live right in the confines of the city of Sudbury itself?

The only cost to the city of Sudbury, as I understand it—my colleague from Sudbury who was on council until recently indicates that the city of Sudbury paid out I think $16,000 last year for losses incurred. But to rule out the other people in the community at large from acquiring some type of geared-to-income housing, doesn't the minister think he should intervene in that type of decision by that particular housing authority and base the housing allocation on need?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course I didn't concur. The hon. member is stretching it a bit. I have the answer here which I gave him in the House—there is nothing in here which said I concurred. I can do no better than just repeat what I said on that occasion:

> . . . Ontario Housing developments in any municipality are constructed to meet the needs of that municipality as determined by a survey of its residents which is made at the request of council. By the terms of the agreement between the municipality and the senior levels of government under which Ontario Housing is built, the municipality assumes responsibility for 7½ per cent of the operating deficit each year. Because of this financial commitment, most municipalities stipulate that some period of residency is required before an application for Ontario housing can be considered. The city of Sudbury has not made this stipulation but there is at present a severe shortage of adequate housing there . . .

That question was dated March 3.

At March 1, 1972, the Sudbury Housing Authority had 2,303 applications outstanding for family housing, and 564 for senior citizens' housing. Sudbury Housing Authority has indicated that, notwithstanding the situation, it will accept applications from outside the city of Sudbury for consideration, and the current shortage has been relieved.

Now is the hon. member suggesting that, even though a municipality has requested us to build housing in its municipality, which is the way we do it, and they are prepared to pay 7½ per cent of the cost of the operation, we should say to that municipality, "Even though you are paying 7½ per cent you are going to have to take whoever we feel needs the housing, regardless of where their residency is"? I need only think of two or three locations that come to mind. In fact there is one currently where there is a problem, where two municipalities are close together, and there is a housing sohrtage in one. There is some difficulty in getting that municipality to agree to go into such a housing programme although the municipality right next to it is prepared to do it; they are prepared to pay the 7½ per cent. Shall we tell the council of that municipality, "It doesn't make any difference if you are paying 7½ per cent, if the citizens of the adjoining municipality, who need housing are going to come in here you are going to have to give it to them, regardless of whether you have looked after your own citizens first"? Does he want us to tell that to Sudbury?

Mr. Martel: Yes, I want you to tell it to Sudbury.

Mr. Lewis: Of course.

Mr. Martel: Because regional government—you people have been prattling about regional government for three years—you haven't moved in. You are talking about a community

that maybe tomorrow will have a bill introducing it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member has made his point, we will get in touch with the city of Sudbury and we will tell it that, at the urging of its member in this Legislature—we feel that he has a point, and that the city of Sudbury should cancel out that portion of the agreement and that they should take anyone OHC feels is suitable for housing in that—

Mr. Deans: Will you do it in Hamilton too?

Mr. Lewis: I should think you would do that.

Mr. Martel: I am delighted to see the minister is going to do that because, in fact, tomorrow you will see a bill probably introduced to the House bringing about regional government—something your government has been talking about for three years. And the deficit operating cost last year was a grand total of $16,000.

There is a second question I want to ask the minister—and maybe he'll be just as helpful as he was on the last one. I understand, Mr. Minister, that the municipality I'm from, Capreol, has just got approval for 10 senior citizen units. There is indication, however, that this is going to take—from the drawing board to completion—at least a year. Why would that take so long? The resolution has been submitted to you by council—why would it take so long to go ahead with 10 senior citizen units in a municipality that has sewer and water and is adjacent to the property it is going to be on? Why a year?

An hon. member: You are not very well informed.

Mr. Martel: Oh, I'm well informed. My father-in-law is the mayor.

Mr. Timbrell: A problem at home.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member want Sudbury to change its views?

Mr. Martel: No, no.

Mr. Timbrell: His problem is in-laws. He wants you to solve it.

Mr. Chairman. The member for Sudbury East isn't finished yet. Would the hon. member for St. Catharines (Mr. Johnston) resume his seat? The member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) is next on the list I have here.

Mr. Lewis: Before the member for St. Catharines?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, he is next on the list.

Mr. Lewis: The member for St. Catharines occupies too much time of the House as it is.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair will make that decision.

Mr. Lewis: I would think that he should take his place.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair arranges the roster. We will conclude with the member for Sudbury East and then the member for Windsor-Walkerville, and we will go on from there.

Mr. Martel: I am just waiting for a reply.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair is very tolerant, we'll wait.

Mr. Singer: That poor fellow from St. Catharines, you should hear him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Sudbury—Sudbury East is it?

Mr. Martel: Sudbury East.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: East; it is not in Sudbury East. We are going to ask the council what the hon. member asks. I am advised that there has to be a re-survey because there was not sufficient response to the first one, and they are waiting for the council to give us a resolution to do another survey.

Mr. Martel: To do another what?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do another survey.

Mr. Martel: Another survey? The community owns the property.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: More than 10 units?

Mr. Martel: Yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: The minister said he had approved 10 units.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will look into that and find out if there is any reason why we have to wait for another resolution.

Mr. Martel: They submitted a resolution, the one you requested, a month ago. It's in.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There has to be another resolution, I am advised, because our agreement with Central Mortgage and Hous-

ing requires us to get a resolution. A survey is going to be done. The first survey wasn't successful—oh, I am sorry, I got it wrong. The re-survey was done and now that we are prepared to proceed with it, we need a resolution from the city council to proceed with the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —they did at the last meeting? When was that?

Mr. Martel: The resolution was sent in several weeks ago. Do you want me to dig it out for you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It must be some of that slow federal mail. I will check it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will give you an answer in the morning.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may have the minister's attention, may I ask him if the department has undertaken any research into the FHA programme 235, and I specifically refer to the mortgage interest subsidy programme, the programme under which an individual can purchase a home with as little as the first month's downpayment and repay the home just as he would rent and would have as low an interest rate as one per cent a year and it increases according to the individual's earnings? There is a ceiling of approximately $7,000 as gross earnings that the person could possibly make before he would be eligible for some phases of the programme. The programme apparently has been quite successful in some of the cities in which it was undertaken. I wonder whether the department has looked into it and can report to us as to whether it could be applicable to the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Our people have been to Washington and discussed it with the HUD people in Washington and I think it is presently under consideration by the federal government and we are in touch with them on that. It may very well be that out of this will come a programme something in the same nature eventually.

Mr. B. Newman: And how long has the department been pressing the federal government concerning the implementation of such a programme?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Our people have just been down to Washington recently.

Mr. B. Newman: Just recently?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, about 2½ months ago.

Mr. B. Newman: About 2½? Is the minister aware that I presented this to the department back in 1970 and asked them to look into the 235 programme? Surely you wouldn't wait approximately two years before you would investigate something that has proven successful in another jurisdiction, would you, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that the programme as it originally existed had a great number of problems involved in it, and because of the problems that were involved it was felt that it would be better to see how it works out for some length of time. There were a lot of bugs that had to be ironed out in the programme, and apparently it was just as well that they waited before rushing into it just because it appeared to be successful at first blush. Some of these things have been ironed out and now they have a better picture of what the programme is. The federal people have a better picture of it—I mean the American federal people—and probably we will be able to learn by their mistakes.

Mr. B. Newman: Could the minister provide us with any additional information as to how low an income ceiling would be established under the proposed Ontario or the proposed provincial-federal agreement on a similar programme?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We don't have such an agreement yet, of course, so we couldn't tell you that.

Mr. B. Newman: All right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That would have to be ironed out. If we decide to go together on such a programme, it will have to be ironed out.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, I'm pleased to see that even after two years—after the suggestion was made and after a programme has been implemented in another jurisdiction—that both Ontario and Canada decide that there is some value in programmes implemented and operative in other jurisdictions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We're always willing to learn, you know that.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Minister, I think the action on behalf of your department was a little too slow. I can understand there may be difficulties with the US programme, but with the extra abilities that you claim are present in your department, surely you could have foreseen some of the difficulties, ironed them out, and probably come out with even a better programme than the US Federal Housing Authority programme 235.

That provides housing to individuals with as low an income as $7,000 and even that ceiling decreases, if it is in certain areas of the United States. Even in the city of Detroit, I understand, the maximum income is only $7,000. So you can see that that's a pretty fair programme, if a person earning only $7,000 would be able to buy a home, paying as low as $104 a month and on a one per cent mortgage interest.

May I ask the minister, at this time, if the department has considered purchasing older homes in the community, rather than building new homes, taking them over by Ontario Housing Corp. remodelling them or fixing them up, and then putting them out, either on a rental basis or on a sale contract basis?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The corporation is already doing that.

Mr. B. Newman: But you're only doing that on a rent subsidy programme?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we are buying houses.

Mr. B. Newman: You are buying older homes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We own about 400 of these across the province.

Mr. B. Newman: That's very good, Mr. Minister. I didn't realize that. I think it's a forward step. I think it's another way of providing housing. What is the difference whether you buy a new home or an older home if it has been remodeled and is in first-class shape?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Except that they are hard to come by.

Mr. B. Newman: Too often people think that they have to go into a new accommodation all the time, whereas a lot of the older homes are very substantial and could satisfy the needs in the community.

May I ask the minister what experience has the department had with the rent subsidy programme that they announced well over two years ago? It was supposed to be the answer to everything and apparently it seems to be extremely slow in getting off the ground in any substantial numbers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We now have somewhat over 600 units under the rent supplement programme and we have an agreement with the federal people for about 1,000 more across the province.

I told the hon. member that having the programme and finding the housing are two different things. It's very difficult to get landlords to let us have the units under this programme. We're beginning to meet a little more success than we have in the past, because it's becoming known that OHC attempts to be just a little more judicious than they thought we would be in the families we've been sending them.

They know they can depend upon us to co-operate and give them good tenants and, of course, they're assured of their rent. So it's meeting with a little more success. I would like nothing better—I mentioned this in the House some time ago—than to build fewer units and to arrange for thousands upon thousands of rent supplement units, if we could do that.

We have some other plans in the oven with respect to the mixing of rental units within larger private rental apartments. It hasn't come to fruition yet. There are quite a few complicated matters to be ironed out; but of course that's a good programme.

Mr. B. Newman: Has the department ever considered renting the accommodations or leasing the accommodations of individuals who are now living in them, and subsidizing their rentals on the geared-to-income basis; rather than going into the market and attempting to convince landlords that they should lease the home to them?

There are a lot of senior citizens, and even a lot of individuals living in family units, who are content to live where they happen to live at the present moment, but can't afford to be paying the rentals that they are paying. I think you might have an answer to some of the problems in some municipalities.

I get calls from a lot of senior citizens who say: "I would be content to stay here, but I can't afford to stay here because of excessive rentals and, as a result, try to get me senior citizens' highrise or other senior citizens' geared-to-income housing."

I think that the same approach could be

used for housing accommodations for families. May I have the minister's reply to that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It sounds like a good idea except that there are real problems to it. For example, you would then be getting into a position where you would probably be in competition with landlords, who then raise their rents knowing that OHC would walk in, or some government agency would walk in, and pay a supplement to keep the person from moving out. I think that is one of the problems that I can see.

Mr. Cassidy: There are means to control that if your government had been willing to try.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How yould you do that? How?

Mr. Cassidy: I'll tell you when I get up to speak.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are you talking about rent control?

Mr. Cassidy: Sure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right then.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, you could still lease that home for the individual.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. If you were the landlord and we had somebody who applied for public housing—

Mr. B. Newman: Yes!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and our people took a look at your situation and said, "Well, that person is somebody we would like to accommodate, but rather than move him out everything else seems to be all right except he can't afford his rent."

Mr. B. Newman: Right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then we would supplement his rent. But what's to keep landlords in those cases from deliberately raising rents, knowing that they've got a tenant of that nature?

Mr. Singer: Because you canvass in advance.

Mr. Cassidy: Only the member—

Mr. Singer: You are looking for excuses.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, when you are handling millions of dollars; the hon. member for Downsview doesn't appreciate it.

Mr. Singer: I appreciate far better than you know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When you are handling millions of dollars of public funds you have to be careful of the kind of programmes you can effect.

Mr. Singer: When you have 600—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To the hon. member it sounds like a good idea but, if he thinks it over, he'll find—

Mr. Singer: We have 600 of this plan you failed in. Macauley was glorious about it four years ago.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the minister is assuming that all landlords are gougers when he makes a blanket statement like that. There are a lot of landlords who would be willing to accommodate you under that scheme. Why don't you try it to see if it will work?

Mr. Singer: Yes, try it. You'll like it.

Mr. B. Newman: If it doesn't work, all well and good, then you abandon that idea. But I think the idea has a lot of merit and I think it deserves at least a pilot project on the part of the department to find out if it is feasible. If it will not work, Mr. Minister, I'll accept the idea that it doesn't work; but I know landlords who would be willing to rent their accommodations, or lease their accommodations to families at a set rental for a set period of time.

Mr. Singer: Macauley talked about it eight years ago; it was never done.

Mr. B. Newman: You should certainly take that into consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Will there be further discussion on vote 804?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, I have more before we go, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: You will be allowed to discuss it in due time. The committee will have to rise now in order to report by 10:30.

Mr. Singer: You'll probably never get odds on it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the first item of business will be government notice of motion No. 5, to be followed by the further consideration of estimates.

I would expect that tomorrow, at the closing of the House, I will be able to detail the complete business for next week, including legislation. I would particularly inform the member for Downsview to be present on whatever day that is, because—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, yes. Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have a strange feeling that the insurance bill might be called.

Mr. Singer: The minister is so helpful. He is all heart.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Make sure it is a night session.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Estimates, Ministry of Revenue, Mr. Grossman, continued 3387

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 3420

No. 86

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, June 9, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1972

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have as visitors with us today: In the east gallery students from Our Lady of Fatima School of Naughton and Gladstone Senior Public School of Toronto; in the west gallery there are students from St. Francis de Sales School of Downsview and Alexander Dunn Public School of Canadian Forces Base, Borden; and in both galleries we will have people from the Jones Avenue Adult Centre of Toronto.

At 11 o'clock this morning we will be favoured with a visit from the Commonwealth League for Educational Exchange.

Statements by the ministry.

LEAD POLLUTION LEVELS

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, in response to increasing public concern and numerous inquiries concerning lead pollution, I would like to make a short statement on the levels of lead in the atmosphere of Ontario's cities.

Under the Revised Regulations of Ontario No. 15/70, a 24-hour maximum level of 15 micrograms of ambient lead per cubic metre of air is deemed to be the maximum concentration to which the general public should be exposed. Consideration is presently being given to reducing this level, possibly to as low as five micrograms per cubic metre.

There are only two locations monitored in Ontario where the 24-hour level, averaged over one year, exceeds five micrograms per cubic metre. One is at the toll booth at the Burlington Skyway, with a daily level, averaged over one year, of 7.1 micrograms per cubic metre and a maximum single day's level of 18.8 micrograms per cubic metre. The other is at the junction of Pharmacy Avenue and the Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, Scarborough, with a daily level, averaged over one year, of 5.6 micrograms per cubic metre and a maximum single day's level of 10.2 micrograms per cubic metre. There is little doubt that both locations are greatly affected by highway traffic.

The concentrations of air contamination from automotive traffic are known to drop off considerably at distances greater than 100 feet from the curb of a highway. This is exemplified by the records at the residential area adjacent to the Burlington Skyway where the average level was 1.8 micrograms per cubic metre.

The air quality monitoring station with the lowest recorded annual mean is at Sarnia airport with a level of 0.3 micrograms per cubic metre. This is also the recording station farthest removed from automotive traffic.

It may be noted that the maximum level of 18.8 micrograms per cubic metre to which the toll booth operators were exposed on the Burlington Skyway is well below the tolerable occupational exposure level, which is set at 200 micrograms per cubic metre for an eight-hour exposure. I believe this level is about to be reduced to 150.

I am advised by the Ministry of Health that it is considering a plan to monitor a cross-section of the public in areas most exposed to automobile fumes. This will include the Skyway toll bridge operators. I am sure the hon. members are already aware that this monitoring has been performed for some time on workers with a high occupational exposure to lead.

In the past there has been very little Canadian information on the lead levels of the general population. The information gained will be correlated with the measurements of lead in the atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONFERENCE IN STOCKHOLM

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. minister who just gave us a statement who our representative is at the Stockholm conference on pollution. I understood that the government was to have a representative; whether or not we put forward anything or just as an observer I am not aware.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, the deputy minister of the ministry is one of the representatives, and there are two other members of staff there.

SALE OF DRAUGHT BEER IN KEGS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Solicitor General, the minister in charge of the Liquor Licence Board and the Liquor Control Board, if there has been any change in the decision made by the board to allow the sale of draught beer in kegs as of June 26; and if in fact this will apply to all parts of the province?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, draught beer in the can will go on sale as of June 26. I am assuming that all of the technical arrangements with respect to putting it on the market will have been attended to.

Those cans will not be sold in northern Ontario in the area where the decision was made that draught beer would be supplied by Doran's brewery.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary having to do with the arrangement the government entered into with Doran's after it was sold to Canadian Breweries, an internationally owned and controlled firm, that only Doran's, that is the wholly-owned subsidiary, would have the right to sell draught beer in the north: Has any further consideration been given that would lead toward a sharing of the market, still maintaining employment in the production of draught beer in those centres in the north where it has previously been established?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, Mr. Speaker, there has been no change. I didn't quite catch the words of the Leader of the Opposition; he seemed to imply there was some sort of an arrangement between the government and the company.

It was really a decision of the government based, of course on certain undertakings which the management group had laid down or undertaken. Nobody has come forward with any other suggestions to date which would enable any change in the status quo related to the continuing employment of the people.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary for purposes of clarification: It would be true to say that Doran's, which is owned by Canadian Breweries Ltd., which is owned by Rothman's, an international company with headquarters in South Africa, has an ironclad monopoly for the exclusive manufacture and sale of draught beer north of North Bay?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I would say that is correct with the exception of the word ironclad.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are going to put it in aluminum kegs, I understand.

QUEEN'S PRINTER

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier on what he based the decision to phase out the office and responsibility of Queen's Printer, which was referred to in the news yesterday?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I think this question might more appropriately be asked of the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow). This is part of the COGP recommendations and it involves certain administrative changes. I think the minister would be delighted to expand upon it in some greater detail if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to inquire of him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just before I direct the question to the Minister of Government Services, the Premier said that this was based on a COGP report. Has that report been made public or is it a previous report? I don't recall reading it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is the report related to information communications which is still pending and will be made available some time fairly shortly.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Why is the Premier beginning the practice of implementing recommendations before the report has been made?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, we have done that in some ways with respect to many aspects of the COGP report.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That is true, you know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly we have.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It's much better than shelving them.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, you will have implemented the whole bloody thing before we see it.

STRIKE AT DUNNVILLE PLANT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour on the continuing matters in Dunnville. Has he anything to report as to what the status of the jobs will be? He has been asked before, I know, but does he have any further information as to whether or not Lanark is going to maintain an operation there—or is this just an extended threat or a bluff?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there is not too much to report this morning. I think there is a story in the Globe and Mail which is quite exact.

Mr. Lewis: It says nothing. It is nicely descriptive. We all love Wilfred List, but it says nothing.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: It says what I think has taken place. A meeting was held and two of our senior officials attended the meeting. We are planning, of course, to call another meeting within seven or 10 days.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the minister going to take some initiative to use, the persuasive energies let us say, of the minister and the ministry to do everything possible to maintain employment in the Dunnville area rather than just allow it to slip away either to some other area in Ontario or right out of the province because of this continuing labour problem?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I suppose if management would listen to the minister, I would be most happy to tell them to keep their jobs in Dunnville, no question about it. I note here a comment by the vice-president of the company in which he says, "We like it here. We want to stay. It is not our intention to move away."

Mr. Lewis: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the Ministry of Labour asked to see the books of the company to see whether or not the allegations they make—that an increase would cause them to fold—are valid?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say. I don't know whether or not they have looked at the books.

Mr. Lewis: The minister doesn't know that?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I don't know.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to see Lanark close down with a loss of 700 jobs without his personal intervention or that of his colleague, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. White)?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: We are doing everything within our power, everything possible at the present time.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Short of looking at the books!

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister personally met with the senior officials of Lanark Manufacturing?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Not as yet.

Mr. Lewis: The trucks are taking the machinery and equipment out of the plant into the United States. How much longer will the minister let it go before he moves in on a multinational corporation that operates in such an arbitrary way?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: We have our experts in the field dealing with them. So far I haven't taken any personal steps to meet the management of the company but everything is being done through our officials.

Mr. Lewis: By way of last supplementary: Can the minister not give the House any report on yesterday's meeting or what the minister's officials reported to him when they emerged from the meeting about their feeling for the company's intentions?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The hon. member must realize that at 11 o'clock last night I finished presenting our estimates in the estimates committee. I had only a very short conservation with our officials early this morning and all I can report is that they are planning another meeting within seven or 10 days.

STRIKE AT KITCHENER PLANT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the same minister, Mr. Speaker: Can he report to the House on a meeting that his departmental officials had yesterday with Dare of Kitchener?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, the meeting with Dare is taking place today.

Mr. Lewis: What will be left of Lanark 10 days from now?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

QUEEN'S PRINTER

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should direct a question pertaining to the Queen's Printer to the Minister of Government Services. Can he tell us what accommodations will be made in order to keep the flow of governmental printed material at its fullest as we have observed it over the last few months?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, the change that has been made in the office of the Queen's Printer is strictly a transfer in position of one individual, who was the Queen's Printer and Publisher, who has been posted to a new position as the director of the special services branch of my ministry. The office of the Queen's Printer still exists and the assistant Queen's Printer is acting as Queen's Printer in the maintenance of the same service at the present time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: The Premier indicated that the report, which he thinks he is going to get in a few days, will recommend that the Queen's Printer's position, or the office, in fact be done away with, in spite of the fact that the Queen's Printer and Publisher was re-established with much fanfare not more than about 15 months ago.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, it is possible that the COGP report on communications that we are awaiting will make recommendations regarding the office—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The Premier admitted it a few minutes ago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —of the Queen's Printer, but I can tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition that to my knowledge no decision has been made at all to do away with the office of the Queen's Printer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary. Really the announcement was just a transfer of the responsibility of Mr. Kinmond from one job to another?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes. Mr. Kinmond has been assigned to new duties within my ministry as a director of a different branch.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a demotion though?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And what the Premier said is incorrect?

Mr. Lewis: The Premier wouldn't let the minister demote him is what the minister is saying.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? If not, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY.

Mr. Lewis: If the Premier will forgive my persistence, I would like to ask again what is the status of the report on Sand Banks and when will the House have the information?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the minister is in Kenora, I understand, today. There was a discussion with Dr. Tovell just a few days ago, with the minister and members of the Natural Resources staff. I am informed that there will be no problem in Dr. Tovell completing his work with respect to the study that he is making.

Apparently, and I am not familiar with the details of this, there have been some complications related to the law suit which have made some aspects of the study somewhat complicated. Unless there are some undue problems at the ROM, which one would hope there would not be, he informed the minister he would be in a position to complete the study.

Mr. Lewis: When?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot tell the hon. member the date. I don't know.

Mr. Lewis: Do I understand the Premier to mean that the notice by the environmental law association that they may at some time wish to pursue some legal route, is complicating the study of an alternative site to Sand Banks?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am informed that the possible law suit may be complicating the study to a certain extent. I cannot tell the hon. member any more than that because that was the information that Dr. Tovell, I understand, gave to the minister.

Mr. Lewis: I would not want the Premier to tell me more than that because it becomes incongruous.

One last supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Premier endeavour to get for the House, by the time Mr. Tovell tables his study, how much aggregate, how much sand, we have lost in the interim period—how many tons—

between the time the study began and the time the study concluded? Then we can ask how much we have lost between the time the study is tabled and the time that the government decides to act. Gradually we will have some sense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I guess one might try to obtain these calculations and put into these calculations—

Mr. Lewis: They are there; they are easy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: One might also ask how much aggregate has been accumulated by natural development in any part of that area. I think one would really have to assess the total amount of sand in the total area that might be available for public use. Whether one could single out the specific area being utilized by Canada Cement, I don't know how relevant that is, but, certainly, if the hon. member is interested in that precise information, while I can't personally do that calculation I'll see whether that kind of information would be available to him.

LAND ASSEMBLY AREAS

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker—I hope he isn't annoyed that I don't use his full title—which areas of future land assembly Mr. Stevenson, the assistant deputy minister, was speaking of when he addressed the Urban Development Institute.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Intergovernmental Services): I was interested in that myself, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry I haven't the memo here this morning which arrived on my desk the day after the Globe story about a week ago. I have been waiting for that question for over a week and I left the memo behind.

On checking with Mr. Stevenson, he tells me that he referred to the north Pickering community and the north Pickering community alone, however it came out in the press. He was speaking from rough notes, which I have seen. He was, in fact, referring to the north Pickering community, and that was the extent of it.

Mr. Lewis: So we need not fear creeping socialism from the government in areas of vast land acquisitions, is what the Treasurer is saying?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What you have to worry about, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if you are somewhat of a reactionary like my friend from Scarborough West, is galloping Progressive Conservatism.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Galloping in all directions!

INCREASE IN GRAY COACH LINES FARES

Mr. Lewis: Yes, simultaneously!

Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications why the Ontario government approved the Gray Coach Lines' increase in fares, given the profits they have received in the last two years; and apparently will again when the next report is out?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Yes Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, I was expecting to give this answer about a week ago.

Mr. Foulds: The minister forgot?

Mr. Singer: They are running late over there.

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister read his answer to yesterday's question in today's Globe?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes I did; and it sounds good.

Mr. Foulds: Better than it did here yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister understand it on second reading?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, I do. Of course, I have a background on it.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the increases relating to the Gray Coach, when there is an application for increase it is filed with the minister and his approval must be sought. However, it has been the policy for some time, and there is legislation that allows it, that the decision is made by the registrar. In view of the amount of the increase, some four cents I believe, this was approved by the registrar, pursuant to his delegated authority under the Public Vehicles Act.

When this came to my attention there had been a subsequent application for an increase by another corporate body, and I have instituted a policy, which will be in effect henceforth, that these applications will go to the body that I think is most competent to examine all matters, that is the

Ontario Highway Transport Board. When it goes to the Ontario Highway Transport Board, because of the legislation passed last year, there are protections built in for the applicant, that he can make certain appeals if the Ontario Highway Transport Board turns him down.

That will be the policy henceforth. It will go to the Ontario Highway Transport Board, simply because I feel it is the body that is competent. I don't think a minister, or with all due respect his registrar, can make a personal decision on these matters. I think it rates a much more competent board than that.

Mr. Lewis: I cannot but agree. By way of supplementary, the minister means this fairly major increase in dollar terms for Gray Coach was granted by the delegated authority given to a registrar, and that was the sum total of the approval required?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there had been a similar increase in 1968. He considered it a very nominal increase, at that time, and in his wisdom he took the initiative on this particular application. As I say, when another application for increase came through and it came to my attention, I arranged to reroute the applications. They will all go to the Ontario Highway Transport Board.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions? The hon. Minister of the Environment has the answer to a question previously asked.

POLLUTION CONTROL AT BARRYS BAY

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) asked a number of questions having to do with Adventure Charcoal.

The first question was: "Has the company presented acceptable plans for pollution control for its proposed plant?" The answer is that the company received a certificate of approval from the air quality branch on Feb. 22, 1972.

The next question was: "Has it started construction as yet?" The answer is the staff of the air quality branch visited the site on May 1 and May 24. At that time there was no sign of any activity and no further work had been performed since November, 1971.

The final question: "As a final supplementary, would the minister table for us the maximum safe levels of the various pollutants that could be emitted from this plant?"

The answer to that one is that approval was issued subject to the company meeting the following standards for a 30-minute average at point of impingement: Carbon monoxide—five parts per million; oxides of nitrogen—0.25 parts per million; sulphur dioxide—0.3 parts per million; suspended particulate matter—100 micrograms per cubic metre of air; and in addition ensuring that the effluent gases are completely incinerated at 16,000 deg F with a retention time of one-half second.

In this way we are ensuring that there is no odoriferous or otherwise harmful organic material leaving the stack.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs also has the answer to a previous question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You mean you have all those people here?

NEW TORONTO AIRPORT

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the member from York Centre (Mr. Deacon), asked, I think yesterday, about two reports which he felt had not been tabled in connection with the North Pickering community. I'm advised that we cannot find a Dec. 1970, Department of Transport report and we honestly don't know about it at this moment. I believe one of the staff is going to check with the member for York Centre directly to see if he can be more specific as to what the report is.

The other report which was asked for was a report of Nov. 1971, I believe, a TTC report evaluating sites E and F, and it was essentially an amalgam of two reports which were tabled. The ground transportation evaluation of the Oct. 1971, report was, in effect, reproduced in the Nov. 1971, report. We chose to table the Oct. 1971, report because the other part of the Nov. 1971, report dealt with the environment and this had been updated somewhat. The information which was in the Nov. 1971, report is all contained in the environmental evaluation dated Feb. 1972.

In other words, I'm satisfied that the material which is in that report which was not tabled is essentially contained in two other reports. The staff will be in touch with the member to see if we can find out about the other report mentioned by the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Government Services also has the answer to a question previously asked.

PURCHASE OF US GOODS

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta) had a question regarding the purchase of a piece of equipment by one of the psychiatric hospitals—I believe it was Whitby—and asked why the article was purchased from a United States supplier and whether there were tenders called.

I have checked into this, Mr. Speaker. This equipment was not purchased by my ministry. I understand it was purchased direct by the Ministry of Health.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

LEAD POLLUTION LEVELS

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): I have a question of the Minister of the Environment with regard to his announcement on lead. Has the minister's department had any tests on the level of lead in areas of high traffic, such as immigration and customs entry ports into Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Is the hon. member thinking specifically of Malton airport or Ottawa?

Mr. Ruston: Automobile traffic at Fort Erie, Windsor, Sarnia and places such as that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I couldn't specifically answer that. We've done tests in a number of areas where there is high vehicular traffic. I will get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that this session is rushing to a close, has he been able to break the logjam in his department so we can get some of the bills that we have sent in to be drawn up?

An hon. member: When the member stops talking!

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: When will we get these bills?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, just look at the list on the order paper yesterday. If we just keep on, it is going to continue to be added to in the same way. I'm hopeful the member's two bills will emerge very shortly.

Mr. Shulman: What about the other bills that I have submitted? When will I have those?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The hon. member told me that he had two bills that he was particularly interested in.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary, if I may.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Go and get 'em!

Mr. Shulman: Inasmuch as all five are important, can I expect them before the end of the Legislature—the Legislature sitting?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, the member can expect to have it before the end of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, can I get an answer to that question?

Mr. Speaker: I would think the question is not of urgent public importance.

An hon. member: That's a strong Speaker.

REGULATIONS FOR FARM IMPLEMENTS AT HIGHWAY CROSSING POINTS

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: In view of the extreme danger involved where farm implements are crossing heavily travelled four-lane highways, such as Highway 7 north of Toronto, would the minister consider initiating regulations which provide for flashers on farm tractors and self-propelled implements which, if operated at crossing points on such provincial highways, would require traffic from both directions to stop?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member just lost the rural vote.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I will look into this matter. Obviously, I am not going to answer now.

Mr. Deacon: There have been some very close calls on that highway.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

ORDER FOR NEW INQUEST

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): I have a question of the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. Will the Solicitor General give consideration to the request that a new inquest be ordered into the death of a Frank Sreter Jr. at the Montfort Hospital some weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, that order was issued yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

ACCIDENT AT TRANSFORMER STATION

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: I wonder if the minister could tell me when I might expect an answer to my question in respect to the accident at the Fairbanks transformer station at Roselawn Avenue, Toronto, in view of the fact that one of the victims of this accident is now in a situation where he wishes to go back to his home country and re-establish himself?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I'll see if I can speed that up. I'm not aware of what is involved in getting the information, but hopefully I'll have it for him early next week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

PROPERTY FOR LIQUOR STORE

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Government Services: Does the minister's department look after the purchasing of property for liquor stores, and if so was it involved in the purchasing of property at Barrys Bay?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

HOME-MADE WINE CONVICTION

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Is the Attorney General aware that there was a conviction in Hamilton recently over the giving of a bottle of home-made wine by a person who made it to a friend? Does the minister think that, really, the law in this regard is up to date?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is archaic and old-fashioned.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the circumstances in that case.

Mr. Deans: Will the minister consider changing the law which makes it an offence—

Mr. Speaker: This is a new question. Order please!

Mr. Deans: It's the same question.

Mr. Speaker: It's a new question.

No, it's not supplementary. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker is very irascible today.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

Mr. Lewis: What did Mr. Speaker have for breakfast?

Mr. Deans: What is new about it?

Mr. Lewis: Did Mr. Speaker have a sleepless night?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member asked, in the first instance, whether the hon. the Attorney General was aware of a situation.

Mr. Deans: Right!

Mr. Speaker: Then he asked whether he would consider changing certain laws, in spite of the fact that the hon. minister was not aware of the situation. The question, therefore, is in no way supplementary.

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Ruston: That's telling the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: It's hard to understand.

WHOLESALE GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Is the government considering the introduction of legislation to equalize the wholesale price of gasoline across the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter is under consideration; not the question of introduction of legislation necessarily, but the problem that is faced is under consideration by the government. When there is some information the government will be delighted to inform the House, and in particular the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

And just as a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would casually observe that I really don't think it is a matter of urgent public importance to inquire of you, sir, what you had for breakfast.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: When can we expect an answer? Because the price of gasoline in the north is a matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. Ruston: Also in southwestern Ontario!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of matters that affect the north; this is one of them. There are others of great concern, of course, and we understand that.

It is being considered by the government. I can add nothing to that at this moment.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A supplementary: Is the Premier aware that there is a 17-cent per gallon price spread in Ottawa, and that the situation in Windsor and other places is just as serious for the dealers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with it in some sections of the province; I am in other sections of the province, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

SPEEDING UP OF OMB DECISIONS

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

I would like to ask the minister whether it is the normal practice of the government to bring pressure on other municipal councils in order to get Ontario Municipal Board decisions speeded up?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure how the question relates to the Ontario Municipal Board. I think I'd like a little more explanation and a little fuller question.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the minister could explain why he wrote a letter to the Toronto city council and why he also met with representatives of the Art Gallery of Ontario in order to get a very quick decision from the Ontario Municipal Board at the end of March relating to the Art Gallery's extension. Would the minister consider that a normal kind of practice on the part of the government?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, under these circumstances I would, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, could the minister explain the circumstances that prompted him to seek to get the OMB to cut short its normal procedures; not just by a matter of weeks, but in fact to cut them down from weeks to a matter of hours?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't any cutting of normal procedure. All the necessary steps had to be followed; the necessary consideration had to be given. It was a matter of trying to reduce the length of time it usually takes for the OMB to make a decision of that kind.

If the hon. member will look at the bill that is on the order paper, he will see that this also reflects the particular transaction whereby the Art Gallery is attempting to enlarge its facilities and to have the necessary title to these facilities to complete its expansion work at the site.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

HIGHWAY CARRIERS' RATES

Mr. Yakabuski: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

It's my understanding that at present the highway carriers and other carriers in this province—

Mr. Deans: Question! Question!

Mr. Yakabuski: —are not required to apply for rate increases to the Ontario Highway Transport Board—

Mr. Deans: Question! Come on, Mr. Speaker, apply the rules.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't hear the first two or three words.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: He said: "It's my understanding—."

Mr. Speaker: Then the hon. member for Renfrew South is out of order. He will ask the question.

Mr. Deans: Right. Absolutely!

Mr. Yakabuski: Under the present regulations, the highway carriers—

Mr. Speaker: Question! Question!

Mr. Shulman: Tell him. That's a good boy!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Yakabuski: All right!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will—

Mr. Shulman: How, why, where—that is it.

Mr. Yakabuski: I will have to reword it.

Mr. Foulds: Particularly for the government press release.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Yakabuski: I wanted to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications if his ministry is giving consideration whereby a highway carrier in this province will be required to make application for rate increases—

Mr. Foulds: Very good.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Well done.

Mr. Yakabuski: —in view of the exorbitant rates charged by carriers in this province today—

Mr. Lewis: He's making gratuitous comments.

Mr. Yakabuski: —and, as a matter of fact, they are looking for further increases.

Mr. Speaker: Question. Question!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why doesn't the member give a speech some day?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): He's picked up some of the opposition's bad habits.

An. hon. member: Let the legislation do it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): If not, why not?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister is about to give a reply.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member, when he says highway carriers, could he be more specific?

Mr. Yakabuski: When I refer to highway carriers, I refer to those companies that haul freight and other express across the province.

Mr. Deans: There is no provision in the rules for the minister to ask a question of the backbencher.

Mr. Speaker: It's a question of clarification.

Mr. Yakabuski: If he wishes me to name them, I could name a great number of them—Toronto - Peterborough Transport, Smith Transport and the like.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, no.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: It's the Liberal Party's turn. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Yakabuski: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. A supplementary?

Mr. Yakabuski: If not, why not?

Mr. Foulds: Just because!

Hon. Mr. Carton: This is a loaded question, Mr. Speaker. I was going to answer and say because the minister says so, but I won't say that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR BICYCLES

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of the tremendous popularity of bicycles and the fact that Ontario has approximately two million bicycles—

An hon. member: Question!

Mr. B. Newman: —is the department, either alone or in conjunction with the fed-

eral government, considering the establishment of manufacturers' safety standards for bicycles?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am not aware of any participation by my ministry in this, Mr. Speaker, but I shall check into it.

We are of course, as I mentioned some time previous, receiving many briefs relating to the establishment of bicycle paths and other matters relating to bicycles, so this would be a proper emanation from our study in that area. We are a free-wheeling ministry.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes. On the same subject, would the minister also consider working with the manufacturers in the province to develop better identification on bicycles in view of the theft problem, which according to the police has become epidemic in the larger cities of the province?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this is a valid question and I will check into it. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Provincial Secretary for Social Development has the answer to questions asked previously.

DISTURBANCE AT PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Yesterday the hon. member for High Park raised a question in connection with an incident at the Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital. I have received a report from officials of the Ministry of Health and understand that there was such an incident in the child and adolescent unit at the Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital on Sunday night, June 4.

Apparently five of the adolescent patients piled the furniture up against the door to their ward, being quite upset that one of the girls was to be transferred to a foster home provided by the Children's Aid Society. As the situation has been going on for some hours and some of the adolescents were becoming quite anxious — indeed, there was evidence of panic — in the opinion of the staff there was nothing else they could do and they therefore called the police to assist them.

The police were called at 8 o'clock in the morning of June 5. I am advised that the whole situation was an extreme, brief reaction on the part of the adolescents and is being dealt with therapeutically by the hospital staff.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary: One of the staff was held as a hostage. Was he or she hurt in any way?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, no. There was no staff injury.

REORGANIZATION OF WHITBY HOSPITAL

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, there was a question raised yesterday by the hon. member for Parkdale in connection with the attendance of a member of the staff at Whitby with respect to the 14th annual convention of the Registered Nursing Assistants Association, which was held in May at the King Edward Hotel. I am advised that Mr. McNutt, to whom reference was made, did in fact attend the conference and that his expenses were in fact paid.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister realize that implicit in the memo was the decree by the superintendent that, had he known in advance of the request to go to the convention, he would have denied that to Mr. McNutt on the grounds of his alleged political opposition to the reorganization in the hospital? Does he think that is appropriate for a hospital?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, as long as we are using the term political with a small "p"—

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —there has been some exchange of correspondence and memoranda between the administrator and the director of nursing that would suggest there was a difference of opinion with respect to who should attend this conference. I will make it my business to discuss this matter with the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) who no doubt will want to take that up with his staff at that time.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the minister will realize the word is not mine; it was used in the superintendent's memo. I believe "politically oppositional" was the way he put it—or something of that kind.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): A supplementary: Is the minister aware that in the hospital at the moment there is a general feeling among some of the staff that they will

lose their jobs because of the actions of this administrator?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a staff meeting scheduled at the hospital early next week in the hope of having a fairly frank discussion about some of the problems, if any, that may exist; so we are hopeful this will be a matter discussed at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The Premier has the answer to a question asked previously.

ONTARIO HYDRO-ELECTRIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member for Waterloo North asked about the Hydro-Electric Advisory Council, suggesting it hadn't met for some 15 years. If my information is correct, I believe it would be somewhat longer than that. Oct. 15, 1954, was the last meeting of the advisory council.

Mr. Singer: They're right up to date.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There was a meeting scheduled for late January, 1955, but because of the passing of the late Robert Saunders that meeting was cancelled.

I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that it was felt that while the advisory council might have been somewhat helpful back in 1953 or 1954, perhaps it wasn't really serving any useful purpose, and since that date I understand there has been no meeting of that particular council. Perhaps this could be conveyed to the member for Waterloo North.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, since the hon. member isn't here: Wouldn't the Premier feel that some of the problems that became so apparent that a task force into the Hydro organization had to be appointed would have been perhaps less pointed and severe if there had been some means, through this advisory committee, whereby the opinions of the community had been brought to bear on the decisions made by Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is assuming or presuming something that may emanate from the task force report, which may or may not in fact be the case.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am assuming there was some reason to appoint a task force.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is reason to appoint task forces in many areas, to assess many things. I would only express a personal point of view—

Mr. Foulds: They do it every day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: It is not necessarily—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would doubt that if the advisory council had been functioning over the past number of years it would have negated the desirability to have an assessment of Hydro. Now that's only a personal point of view. Never having been a member of that advisory council I really can't comment in great detail.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier was on HEPC.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the advisory council is established by a section of the Act, why did the government, then and now, decide to let the appointments to the advisory council lapse entirely?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that it was done some years ago; and as there's been no indication of any need to alter this, that probably the advisory council wasn't really—

Mr. Singer: Advising!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —dealing with any issues that would be helpful. I can only assume that it was not really fulfilling any useful purpose, and knowing the desirability expressed by the member for Scarborough West not to have any surplus amount of advisory committees that aren't doing something of significance, I can only assume that those responsible then made that judgement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Can the Premier tell us if, when he was vice-chairman of Hydro—he was at one stage, no?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right! Did he feel that there was sufficient input—I might as well use the word—from the consuming public without the functioning of the advisory council; or was he completely unaware of the statutory requirement that such a council be established?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can only say yes—there's no question. I was not familiar with the possibility of an advisory council and I could only say in my very

brief tenure as vice-chairman of Hydro, for some nine months, that in my view, there was certainly some input—and I guess this is a very good word to use with respect to Hydro, or maybe it should be output, I don't know—but I would think there was and still is. Another point that must be emphasized in discussions of Hydro is that while this assessment is going on, which I think will be very helpful to all of us, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission in this province has by and large done a very commendable and very creditable job—but I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition would be the first one to acknowledge this, I'm sure he would.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, yes!

Mr. Speaker: There have been a reasonable number of supplementaries. The hon. member for High Park.

KIDNAPPING OF LEIGH ANN BEDARD

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Has the Attorney General had an opportunity to review the case of the young girl whose legal custody was awarded to her mother, but who was subsequently kidnapped by her father, in which case the Attorney General's department refused to assist?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I have reviewed it and I will have an answer for the hon. member, probably on Monday.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. the Leader of the Opposition have a new question?

CRITICISM OF TRANSPORTATION MINISTRY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Can the minister explain why the member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hamilton) was quoted in the Ottawa press as saying that talking to the minister's department was like "talking to the wall" when it came to getting information about the expansion and the maintenance of the road system in eastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Well I am glad he said it was talking to the department rather than the minister, because—

Mr. Lewis: He had other words for the minister, not so kind.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —because the minister has seen many delegations from all parts of the province since assuming this ministry. In fact, to my knowledge, I have not turned down any delegation that wanted to see me; and certainly when they come with a delegation with specific problems they are looked into very carefully.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the minister not agree that it wasn't that the minister did not receive delegations but that the request from the member concerned and others for the more rapid development of an adequate road system in eastern Ontario had been unfulfilled? They're not complaining that they can't talk to the minister; it's that nothing comes from it.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I think most members in this Legislature would probably say the same thing because they all want—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well we would, certainly!

Hon. Mr. Carton: —their own particular area looked after. One can realize that every riding in this province has road problems in their own minds but my ministry has certain—

Mr. Singer: That is where the road problem exists—in the mind, not the ground.

Hon. Mr. Carton: In my ministry there are certain criteria to be met before certain roads are built and we determine them on a very fair and equitable basis.

Mr. Shulman: Don't build any roads in my riding.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Snow, on behalf of the Hon. Mr. MacNaughton, presented the annual report of the Civil Service Commission of Ontario for the year 1971.

Mrs. M. Birch from the standing social and development committee reported the following resolution:

Resolved: That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Labour be granted to Her

Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973:

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

Ministry administration programme	$3,426,000
Occupational safety programme	$3,015,000
Industrial relations programme	$1,874,000
Human Rights Commission programme	$ 595,000
Employment services programme	$1,935,000

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that commencing next week the House will resume normal Wednesday sittings.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, there is a bit of an exchange here. Does that include evening sessions?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It does not. That's normal, the way the Wednesday sitting used to be.

Mr. Deans: And on Monday we will change it to evenings.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Tuesday!

Mr. Deans: Tuesday!

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the estimates of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications stand referred to the estimates committee in lieu of the resources development committee, as previously ordered.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: The government notice of motion No. 5, the hon. Mr. Davis.

RESOLVED: That a commission be appointed to study the function of the legislative assembly with a view to making such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect thereto, with particular reference to the role of the private members and how their participation in the process of government may be enlarged, including the services, facilities and benefits provided to the members of the assembly; the membership, remuneration and costs of the said commission and the manner of payment therefor to be determined by the Lieutenant Governor in Council; and that the said commission shall have full power and authority to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath; and the assembly doth command and compel attendance before the commission of such persons and the production of such papers and things as it may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the hon. Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I will only speak very briefly to this. This matter and the probability of this taking place has been discussed here now for some period of time. This is a recognition that we feel there should be an assessment of the role of the private members within the legislative process. The question of the functioning of the committees of this House and of course the question of services for the private members by way of office accommodation and other benefits, are in my view included in this resolution.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this assessment could turn out to be one of the more useful assessments that is made within this jurisdiction. I personally am very optimistic about what it may produce, and of course I think that the time is rather important. It would be my hope that if this resolution is carried here this morning that the appointment could go ahead some time next week and we could conceivably have at least an interim report in time for discussions at the next session, the next session being some time after January 1, 1973.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, this matter has been discussed really at some length in indirect ways over the past period of time in this House and I feel there is nothing further that I need, or can usefully add at this time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: (Leader of the Opposition). Mr. Speaker, we on this side intend to support the resolution. In case there is some misconception in the minds of any of the members, I would say that since it was announced in the Speech from the Throne we have been prepared to support the resolution at any time that it might have been brought in.

We think that it is a very useful one indeed. The first reservation that occurred to those of us in the Liberal Party was that the resolution should have made accommodation for the commission to have on it some mem-

bers of the Legislature itself. I still feel that this might be an improvement, but certainly the commissioners, whoever they will be—and their appointment is to be announced next week—will surely have the time and the availability of getting the views of the members of the Legislature as they see fit.

On the other hand, this is the occasion where we, as members, can put on the record for the assistance, perhaps of the members of the commission, some of the views that we have in this regard. I agreed, not only with the Premier but with many other members who have indicated that the role of the members of the Legislature and the Legislature itself, must be reviewed and upgraded; particularly with the series of reports of the Committee on Government Productivity. There has been a wholesale revamping of the lines of responsibility in the ministry and, I think, quite a changed attitude and approach to the Legislature by the ministry.

I am not here particularly to debate that at this time, but simply to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I sense this even more than was the case in previous years. The ministry and the ministers overweigh in the importance of the jobs that they have, the individual members of the Legislature. And whether it be true or not, there is a sense that the government keeps the Legislature around as sort of a mongrel dog that it is nice to pat from time to time, or if the ministry wants to use this as a forum for certain statements.

I have felt this more and more in the 10 years that I have been in the Legislature. Because of the increased time that is necessary for the ministers, most of them, to perform their jobs, and particularly for the Premier to lead the government and do all of the things that are necessary for him to plan and carry out personally, that the Legislature more and more is becoming sort of the poor cousin in the whole role of government. This is a role that is harder and harder to bear, whether the member is in opposition or in backbench support of the government.

I sense this and I believe that many private members feel the same way about this Legislature and the role of the individual members. We welcome this commission, and I agree that it might very well be of utmost importance, not only to us as individuals, but to the development of a workable democracy in Ontario.

I have some specific things that I would like to briefly put before you, sir. The first has to do with the provision of assistance at the constituency level for the individual members.

In my capacity as leader, I take the opportunity whenever I can to visit my members in their offices, particularly the ones in the Liberal Party in the north wing, and sit down and talk to them about a number of problems, and of course to lay plans and designs for the further eroding and undermining of the government and the party in office. But sometimes our attention strays to other matters. And as I talk to my members and they come back from the constituency on Monday or Tuesday, or whenever it is possible for them to return to Queen's Park, I am more and more impressed with the work-load that the individual member must carry in the constituency. Often the thought is expressed: "Well it is a relief to get back to Toronto and get away from the phone calls that come in from the constituency at home."

Now I must say to you, Mr. Speaker, that my own experience is a bit different from that. Because most days I do return to my home. So I can keep the calls followed up day-by-day and that means that there is not a flood of people waiting to talk to me on the weekends. But certainly for those members who must leave their constituencies and come to Toronto and be here most of the week, the weekends are becoming unbearable.

Now from my point of view, I suppose I am concerned about the members themselves; but our first concern must be about the constituents who would have to either postpone an opportunity to talk to the member, or in fact find that the lines of communication are busy and it is difficult to get to the member.

I think this is something that must give us our first concern, and this is why one of the recommendations that I would support, that has already come forward from other members, is that there should be some accommodation for an office, or some sort of staff at the constituency level.

Most of us find that, as in my case, my wife is my constituency secretary as far as receiving calls from constituents is concerned. She is becoming very adept at it, as a matter of fact, at problem solving and so on, and who to call and what procedures might be followed. But I hardly think that it is fair nor equitable for us to continue this way as the workload for the individual member in the constituency increases.

I remember having a debate with the former Premier about the need for an ombudsman in the Legislature; responsible to the Legislature but to be available to the people in the province if they feel that they are caught in the convolutions of bureaucracy and they are not well served by the ministry.

One of the comments that Mr. Robarts made in answer—well he wasn't particularly opposed to the concept of an ombudsman, but he said, "All of us as members are ombudsmen." And that undoubtedly is true.

We are seen to be that by our constituents; and this is a healthy position for us to occupy. That is, independent of the decisions made by government. Whether we support the government in the House or not, the individual member has the responsibility to take up the cause of the individual in his constituency and see that everything possible can be done to ensure him a fair and equitable hearing.

So, if we are not going to have an ombudsman—and I hope that some time we will—and even if we do have an ombudsman, the role of the member can be improved by providing certain supportive services at the constituency level. I would suggest an office with a full-time employee and I would also suggest that it should be possible for everyone in the constituency to contact that office without having to pay for long distance charges.

Certainly in my constituency, at least two-thirds of the residents have to pay long distance charges when they contact me. This is unfortunate. I don't think that the charges are great, no more than probably 45 cents from the furthest corner, but it is the sort of thing that should be a part of the programme to enable the people at the constituency level to contact their member, or a person who is employed by or in the service of the member and who is doing this on a business basis.

The facilities available to members here I think have been improved tremendously. We are not prepared to criticize them at all, although as I look toward the resumption of a more private capacity in this Legislature, giving up the leadership, I go up and down the rows of offices selecting one that I think would be fitting for me when my place is taken by one of my colleagues or someone else. I threaten them somewhat in this connection, but I simply point out that the office facilities are excellent.

Ten years ago, when I came in as a member, the opposition members were told by the Premier that we could use the desk in here, which wasn't much of a favour. I think the whole of the Liberal caucus and a small room packed into what is now the lobby. We used to call it the bullpen for some reason, I am not just sure why. There were three phones in there and that served the caucus at that time. So certainly the facilities have improved and we have no complaint about that.

I do believe in the future there will be a secretary assigned to each member down here. In fact, the improvement in the financial arrangements in support of private members has been such that it should not be long before we can consider a secretary for each member, giving that sort of necessary assistance and service here.

The other thing I want to refer to very briefly is the rules of order in the House itself. I don't know whether the commission is going to concern itself with that. We had a lengthy and quite a good review of the rules of order in the last two or three years and there are very few complaints remaining.

One of them, pertaining to the question period, has been brought to my attention and that of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) more than once, that is the apportionment of the question period time. I doubt very much if that is much of a concern to all of the members of the House. Frankly, I feel that the question period is being well utilized now. Certainly if the commission wanted to give its attention to that, I would be glad to hear its recommendations.

On other matters, I have few complaints with the rules of order that govern us. As a matter of fact, there are opportunities for opposition initiatives which have in the last two years not been fully occupied, having to do with want of confidence motions pertaining to committees and so on. I am glad that that order has been established and recognized and it is available for opposition use when they see fit. I don't believe that any order should be used simply to keep the machinery in working order and well recognized, because the rules are there and they are available to the opposition when matters come up that cannot be otherwise debated.

The private members' hour is one area, I think, of considerable disappointment, certainly to me, and I sense it on all sides, because there is no vote. I suppose there cannot be a vote on a private member's resolution on a regular basis. It seems that it has become really a sort of collegiate debating

exercise. It is an opportunity for members to put forward their views by way of resolution and legislation and have these views discussed in this forum. But if the agreement that is found in the orders that there not be a vote at the end were rescinded, we would go back to the old practice where the government simply has one of its speakers continue the debate, until by the rules the House would have to adjourn. I have always found that that sort of solution is an awkward and archaic one.

I wish that we could have an understanding on all sides that it could be put to a vote of the House without the government being unduly embarrassed, if the next day it did not follow the results of the vote with the introduction of legislation or even proceed to the enactment of the private members' bills that were thus approved.

But you know, Mr. Speaker there have been occasions in the House of Commons, and probably in other Parliaments, where a private member's legislation has been allowed to go forward and been accepted by the government. After having been supported in private members' hour, it has gone forward to be enacted as legislation. The concept that only the government can bring forward legislation which is going to be enacted and become law is a bad one, a wrong one, and it tends to downgrade the role that all of us as members of the Legislature feel that we have, that is we feel that we are part of the law making programme and procedure.

The government's attitude that only they can introduce legislation which in fact is going to be proclaimed is erroneous and bad. I would hope that the Premier would give some consideration to some changes in the private members' hour. If he made it clear by his statement that the policy was to allow the private members' legislation or bills to go forward to a vote, but he would not necessarily be bound by it, and this was understood, at least it would change the private members' hour into a forum which would have more meaning to the public, and I think involve many more members actively in that particular order of business.

The next thing I want to refer to, Mr. Speaker, is the committee system itself, which this year, I think, has taken a great step forward in its relevance and importance. The report of the committee on natural resources which is dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Board is yet to come. In my view, having been present at some of those hearings—not many of them but some of them—and observing the attitude of the members, particularly since the committee was upgraded with the kind of assistance we have said for many years that all committees should have, I feel the report it will give the Legislature is going to be extremely useful to the Legislature and to the community; and, I trust, extremely useful to the government—easily as good as a royal commission report would have been.

We have taken a quantum step forward in this regard. A standing committee of the Legislature has, in fact, been entrusted with a real responsibility by the government, something that has rarely if ever occurred in the past.

I would also say, although the government was not particularly responsible for this, that the committee on the public accounts this year has had a very arduous series of hearings. The information, to some extent I presume, has been a source of embarrassment to some ministers and to the government in general, but surely this is exactly what these committees should be doing? I don't know what their report will be, but it seems to me that whatever it is, if it is based on the information that has been elicited at that committee, it is going to be of great use to the government. While there may be some qualms as they read the reports in the press day by day on information that comes forward, still this is the way this Legislature must operate.

It is going to be the kind of pressure applied to the public service which is going to mean that there is an independent watchdog which may or may not descend upon them without notice and examine very carefully the procedures that they, as public servants, are responsible for. While we, as politicians, attempt on all occasions to put the main responsibility on the elected members who are also part of the ministry, this kind of public pressure applied to the public servants themselves is bound to be useful and efficacious, the kind of thing that keeps the public service as well as the ministry on its mettle and on its toes.

In reference to the committee system, I recognize the improvement and commend the government for acceding in certain areas to allow this improvement to take place.

I do feel, however, that while the standing committees — one for human resources; one for natural resources; one for legal bills and so on—have been effective in being a repository for the reference of bills and matters from the Legislature, one of the serious

drawbacks is that by removing from these committees their specific areas of concern and interest, we have downgraded the role of the Legislature and the individual members once again.

For example, it is not possible for the elected members here—many of them are in their first full session—to opt for a committee assignment in agriculture, in education, in labour, in transportation, in the areas affecting the environment, and follow it up year by year, so that after two or three sessions they become recognized experts in their own field. I've said this before.

I believe, for example, that after two or three sessions the members of the education committee would know the president of the teachers' federation and the president of the University of Western Ontario. We would have had an opportunity to travel around the province, talk to school boards, meet them in their own boardrooms and hear their problems in their own communities.

I think the same is true for agriculture, that there is a tendency for many members of the Legislature to dismiss problems pertaining to that aspect of the overall industry of the province. I don't think it's unfair to say that. I can only view with regret that there is no committee that has on it those members who are concerned with the agricultural industry, who would meet with the federation and the farmers' union, and let's say the other aspects of the agriculture industry, farm machinery people, packers and so on, and which would have an opportunity during the session and between sessions to move out of Toronto and visit those areas of the province where agriculture is carried on and where some of the problems could be examined at first hand.

I don't want to spend a lot of time on this because I've said it before. I do believe there is some middle road whereby we can have large standing committees of the type that we have now, which can deal with legislation and estimates which are referred to them. Whether or not we continue to call them human resources, natural resources, and so on, doesn't make much difference. They could be called committee A and committee B and committee C, for all that matter, because we find, for example, that the committee on natural resources is examining the Workmen's Compensation Board at length. I think they are doing an excellent job, but the relationship between the Workmen's Compensation Board and natural resources is very tenuous indeed, though that committee has been fully occupied with that service.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would think that we might continue the establishment of standing committees of a large general type that can be organized so there are not too many conflicts in membership—and this is what we have achieved over the last couple of years—and that legislation of certain other matters can be referred to them. But I would like to see established, also, a panel of committees that might very well be continuing select committees, that can meet during the session, and also between the sessions, on areas of general interest and concern, such as I have mentioned, on agriculture, education, transportation, the environment, and labour, just to name those few.

I have felt that the members of the Legislature—all of us—should have an opportunity to continue our activities between sessions in matters of this type. If it requires the establishment of continuing select committees, then I would recommend the establishment of those committees. I would say that, if the Legislature does rise at the end of June or sometime within the next few weeks, that it would be incumbent upon the chairmen of these various committees to undertake tours in this province and to have meetings with those people who are concerned with these matters.

It would also give, for example, the group interested in education a cohesion which would enable them to become experts in the field. It would enable them to establish connections with teachers' organizations, taxpayers, school boards, universities, community colleges and so on, so that when the debate takes place in the Legislature here in committee on these expenditures there would be more people interested, concerned and knowledgeable about it. That's the best example. Agriculture is another, the matter pertaining to environment is another and so on. I think this is a matter of some concern and I would hope the commission, if it reads these words, will give it its attention.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned select committees. We have had a series of them over the years and there are several already established and making plans for extensive reviews of pressing problems during the period between the end of this session and the beginning of the next. There may be a time when we will talk a little more extensively about this. Certainly, the procedure of establishing select committees for specific problems is a good one. We have had many of them in the past. I served on one in my experience. It had to do with conservation and it was an

excellent committee. It had certain drawbacks, but the recommendations were good. Many of their particulars have been implemented into legislation and it was worthwhile.

I think the government's tendency to establish ministerial committees or even royal commissions to examine certain areas which they consider important, and throwing the crumbs by way of select committee to the Legislature, has contributed to the downgrading of the role of the member. The Premier is shaking his head but he knows that in recent months—

Hon. Mr. Davis: A select committee is not throwing crumbs to anyone.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —he has established a group of experts to look into the whole matter of death taxes and succession duties. There has been one on education costs. I don't know what it is doing. We don't hear of it, but it is manoeuvering somewhere in the community I trust. He has predicted a special committee to look into the role of the Municipal Board. He's got a task force on Hydro. Those are just four that came to mind very quickly and I know there are others.

On the other hand, his select committee list—well it too is impressive. The only one he's talked about is one on the snowmobile. I wouldn't for a moment say that is not an important area, but it shows, in my mind, the feeling that if they've got a real—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have not talked about a committee on snowmobiles at all, but there has been some considerable discussion about the committee on economic and cultural nationalism, which in my view has performed a very useful role to date and will continue to do so.

To suggest that the select committees are dealing with the crumbs, I think is really quite erroneous. I think it is downgrading the activities of those people who are participating on the select committees. I think those which are presently functioning are very relevant and very important.

I want that to be on the record, because I really don't think the Leader of the Opposition is saying that these select committees, and the people serving on them, are wasting their time or that they are dealing with non-issues or non-essentials. I believe they are relevant and I would like to think the Leader of the Opposition really believes they are as well, because many of his colleagues are serving on them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking very frankly and the Premier has put a point to me which, I think, would go over very well with some of my colleagues. For example, I've discussed this matter with the member for York Centre who is totally committed to the importance of the committee that he serves on—what's the title of that committee?

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Economic nationalism!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On economic nationalism. I'll tell you that the Legislature is fortunate and well served by the fact that the member for York Centre and the member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) are serving on it. That goes without saying, and I cover those tracks.

I would tell you, however, that the Premier has done to death that particular matter. He has had a commission. He has had a full conference in one of the new buildings here, at which he had people from all over the province. He wined them and dined them and he put forward all sorts of papers. They all nodded sagely and dozed off to sleep and went back home while the government put out the press releases about how they were coming to grips and that this was the input as far as economic nationalism was concerned and they were about to take steps.

Then they set up a royal commission having to do with the economic nationalism aspects of book publishing.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Heritage Ontario!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But when they don't want to do anything—the Premier decided a few hours before the session closed last fall to establish a committee on economic nationalism. My God, I can't say it's not important! I can't say that the members who are on it are not going to work hard and appreciate the opportunity to become expert in this field.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why does the member make the observations in the first place?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am just telling the Premier that I don't believe that the government, in appointing that committee, did anything but postpone the need to take some action. They can point with pride to that committee, but in fact what they have done is postpone the need to take action.

I'm not downgrading any of the members. They are pleased to serve on it and it is important. I think the best example is the fact that in matters where the Premier wants some immediate recommendations he establishes a minister's committee or a royal commission. When it comes to getting the members busy, busy; he tells them to look into snowmobiles. I think that is going to be an important committee, too. Our people want to serve on it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't told anybody to look into snowmobiles.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did he or did he not announce that there would be a select committee on snowmobiles? Of course, he did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He needs about 10 more members on his staff to keep track of his announcements.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We haven't appointed any select committee on snowmobiles.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Of course not, but the Premier is contemplating it.

Mr. Lewis: It was the highlight of his Throne Speech.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member mean that is the only part he read?

Mr. Lewis: It is the only part that I can remember.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If my memory doesn't deceive me, there was a little bit more than that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So, Mr. Speaker, if I can conclude this point, and I have only one or two other comments to make, the select committees are going to be a continuing and important aspect of the work of the members of the Legislature. But the government must see that they are given responsibilities which are as important as the responsibilities given the standing committee on natural resources and which it has undertaken in the last few months. They don't all have to be searching investigations of governmental procedures, looking for, let's say malfeasance or something like that. If that comes along, fine, we can deal with that too. But you have got many things that should and must concern the members of the Legislature.

One other thing I want to mention is that I believe the commission should give us recommendations as to whether the facilities for media coverage of the sessions and the work of government and committee should be improved. I personally believe that they should be, that we should remove all of the archaic rules that forbid members of the press and of the other media bringing their tape recorders or any other piece of electronic equipment in here. I believe that—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Including lie detectors!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —the well known maturity of the members on all sides can accommodate even the introduction of TV cameras. In my view we should do away with many of these archaic restrictions based upon the decision made in the mother of Parliaments 400 years ago, that nobody could even bring in a pencil and make notes in case a few weeks later one of the government ministers would be embarrassed by something being on the record. We have got a full record as far as Hansard is concerned; I can't see why the members of the media can't plug their tape recorders into the same system that we have here and make full use of it. There should be no restrictions whatsoever on the dissemination of the thoughts, the ideas, the pearls, even the fiascos that occur in this particular chamber from time to time.

I must say that if television would require the establishment of those banks of atom lights on a continuing basis, it would be pretty tough for some of us with sensitive eyes, or something like that. That's too much to bear. But certainly those television cameras that we see out all the time seem to be able to take pictures even in the dark, I am told.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Never had that experience.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, you don't have to turn white.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Never experienced that!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So it seems to me that we should also not consider any kind of editing, that it is the same responsibility for a television station or radio station as it is for the editor of a newspaper, to print those things which he feels can be substantiated by the facts as they are understood.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Show it all!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would hope that the commission will give us—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would hope that the commission would make some recommendations along these lines.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): You would have a very low rating, I'll tell you, if it were televised!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I was going to say something about redistribution, Mr. Speaker, but I think on all sides the members would be prepared to support what the former Premier did when he established a redistribution commission which was apolitical. We had a chance in the Legislature to express our objections when the report came down, but there were no political changes made in it, except by the redistribution commission itself.

It has to do with the role of the Legislature and the fact that some of us here have many fewer constituents than others, and I think that we should be moving as far as possible toward correcting those anomalies. As the population shifts very rapidly in this province, of course the anomalies, the underrepresentation or the over-representation creeps back in, and I think that we should establish the kind of control on that that will keep it from becoming a serious problem.

My last point has to do with the establishment, once again in the committee system, of a standing committee on economic affairs. Once again, my view has been well known in this regard, that it would be an opportunity for the justification on the part of any group within the community which has, in fact, a monopoly control of a service or a product so that it would be required that they would justify cost changes before this standing committee of the Legislature. It would of course hear the submissions by the medical profession if they wanted to change the fee schedule, which would have a tremendous effect, of course, on the funds required from public sources to provide for medical care.

I would think that it would apply in many respects to changes in wages and salaries. It would apply to changes in insurance costs. I would even say that in those areas where government boards control the cost of foodstuffs, before those changes are approved they would have to come before the economic committee and make a justification.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that such a committee would not be a price and wage control committee. It would be simply a hearing, provided with professional and independent advice, so that the members of the Legislature would be advised of these matters and would then make recommendations to the government of the day as to actions that the government should take.

We do not want to interfere with the responsibility of the ministry; it is the cornerstone of our system. I am not advocating a switch to the congressional system, but simply to give us a means whereby the public interest can be served. I have spoken on this before, and I feel it is one area in which the role of the Legislature could move forward once again in importance, in relevance and in fact, in the strengthening of the democratic process.

In closing, I would say we support the resolution without reservation. We look forward to the report from the commissioners, and I think that even without waiting for the full year, really, before the report might be available, some changes along the lines that many members have put forward on other occasions could be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be unduly extended. The Leader of the Opposition has covered a great many of the matters to which individual members would wish to address themselves. I presume there are other members in this House who will want to participate in this debate, since it deals with enhancing the rights of the private member. And I hope that takes place.

As the Premier knows, since he checked carefully in advance and won approval in advance, the commission resolution will be supported in this Legislature on all fronts. And since some of us have heard the whispering in the wings about whom the commissioners may be—the Premier ultimately will make the statement next week—I think most of us feel pretty comfortable about the import and value of this commission and of the likely searching and effective nature of its inquiry.

I am not quite as anxious about the absence of MPPs on the commission. As a matter of fact, in a sense I think that is probably salutary—particularly when dealing with certain aspects of the commission's terms of reference which deal with what might be called the benefits of members, whether it is constituency offices or what have you—there are considerable values in having a certain detachment, and I think the commissioners to be appointed will probably be first-rate. Having discussed it at some length with the NDP caucus, I know they share that view.

I say that this debate just gives a sort of flavour to the commission, I suppose, if they decide to read Hansard, as to the areas of likely investigation. Clearly I presume and hope that they will choose to meet with all the caucuses, and perhaps indeed with all the members of the Legislature.

I would hope they might agree to make certain studies in comparative jurisdictions. I hope they may agree to meet with certain senior civil servants, who may have comments to make on the accessibility of the private member and the contacts that are made.

I hope, although I say it with caution, that they may meet with members of the media, present and past, who have had occasion to cover the Legislature and to watch its workings. I hope the media will speak to the commissioners directly about the way in which they view the role of members both in the House and in committee, because clearly that too may have some relevance.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that this commission will view its terms of reference in a manner as all-embracing as possible. As a matter of fact, I can't imagine interpreting the terms of reference in any other way. They are as vague as it is possible for mortal man to draft, and therefore they can be all-inclusive. I hope the commission will feel no constraints whatsoever, that it will see its task as setting out a model evaluation which can be viewed by other jurisdictions as worthy of imitation.

I may say to the Premier—this may be a very personal kind of view—that I see this action, if not the single most innovative step, then certainly as one of them in the last several years.

In a sense the rights of the private members that are enhanced by the recommendations of the commission are secondary to the service the commission may perform in preserving and making relevant the parliamentary process, about which all of us feel kind of oppressed and depressed these days—maybe not the Provincial Secretary for Justice, but others of us feel oppressed and depressed. I didn't want him to feel, in his prestigious post, any such dissatisfaction.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't feel oppressed or depressed.

Mr. Lewis: No, I suppose the Premier doesn't either.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He is too Olympian. He breathes different air.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, he is sufficiently Olympian to breathe different air. That's entirely true.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I've wondered.

Mr. Lewis: I'm not sure how one goes about revitalizing the legislative process. I hope it is seen as implicit in the resolution that that is one of the objects; because at the moment this place is characterized by a kind of gradual and desultory suffocation. One would hope that the commission can reverse that. The question of the relevance of the legislative process is not discussed so often any more. It's alluded to occasionally by the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook). There are fleeting whimpers of days gone by, but none of us debate the relevance any more, because it's almost too embarrassing.

I'm not sure that we're a mongrel pup. Given the vintage of those who sit here, we're at least thoroughbreds. But I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition made an analogy which, while not entirely complimentary, had some pertinence.

I'm not sure what accounts for it though, it is particularly pronounced now. It might be a post-election session. I think if memory serves me, that tends to happen immediately after an election campaign.

Hon. Mr. Davis: A lot depends on the results of the election.

Mr. Lewis: The results of the election campaigns in the past have had a rather depressing similarity; so one can draw parallels. It may be indeed the size of the government's majority that has a certain effect on debates, whether deliberate or otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member want to legislate that out?

Mr. Lewis: That's one of the things the commission might look at fruitfully.

Mr. Lawlor: It induces claustrophobia.

Mr. Lewis: It may be the presence of a number of new members, who are as yet feeling their way and are a trifle reticent about the process. It may be the quality, or lack of it, in opposition performance. I'm accepting all of those factors as perhaps contributing to the difficulty of the legislative situation.

I have a feeling that none of the individual factors is, and even all of them collectively are not, as dismal as the enervating weariness of the system that we're now locked into in

the Legislature and in committee. We preserve this antiquarian debating chamber, while all around us tremendous social forces are let loose. Whether it's the expression of discontent in a variety of ways, whether it's citizens' groups, whether it's the use of press and media as sort of opposition to government from time to time and the putting of more unorthodox views, whether it is the tendency to confrontation in certain sections of the society; there are the dynamic social forces lose and here in this chamber—today is much better than any other day, there is a vast attendance—there is a kind of a sense of dislocation, alienation and irrelevance.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How does the member mean, in the chamber?

Mr. Lewis: In the chamber?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the member some question about the place or the way we respond?

Mr. Lewis: Both!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about the place?

Mr. Lewis: What about the place? I wouldn't be quite as averse to allowing people to make notes in the gallery; and occasionally to utter an audible sigh, without being thrown out. Perhaps even a clap, without the minister or the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko) having apoplexy. I'm not entirely sure that these extraordinary constraints—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): I am on the hon. member's side. I suggest he should turn and take a bow.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if he's on my side, I'm clearly wrong. I withdraw anything of which the minister approves.

But I have a feeling, judging from his reaction to the moment when the University of Waterloo students dared to enter the chamber to express vocally some feelings, the minister uttered a number of interjections at the time, which made me feel that he was somewhat critical of their performance.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was more than a sigh, too.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, it was. It was more than a sigh.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was a hyperbole in reverse.

Mr. Lewis: It was more than a sigh; it was actually the expression of a sort of public feeling in the chamber, and the chamber nearly collapsed. And the Speaker very quickly and very appropriately drew them to order, lest the decorum of this chamber be violated beyond repair.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would be very interested in hearing where the hon. member would draw the line.

Mr. Lewis: Right, and I shan't continue.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): They wouldn't even let the kids from Ottawa into this place.

Mr. Lewis: I think that the commission, when it examines the activities—I rather like certain of the debates in the House, and have never lost the feeling that when politicians of different creeds are locked in pretty serious debate around a basic political issue or in a philosophic exchange, this place can be fairly exciting, but it happens less and less frequently these days. I think that's becoming inherent in the system, as the government views it as a stopover, as a resting place between the promulgation of an order in council and the next cabinet meeting. I'm not entirely sure that's the way it should be.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: To decide who goes on the next junket!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where does the member want to go?

Mr. Lewis: Well, at least this cabinet still condescends to hold elections. One isn't sure about the House of Commons!

The committee system, I think, largely inherits what happens here. As a matter of fact, the estimates committee is even more clubby, if that is possible, than the legislative chamber. We go through the stylized formality there too.

However, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, and I would like to support it, there have been two experiments of immense importance. One is the hearings on the Workmen's Compensation Board; the other is the public accounts committee. It would seem to me that in terms of the committee system, they provide an object lesson for the commissioners on how to make individual backbenchers of this House feel useful in the system once again.

I don't know whether that can be extended to committees which deal with legislation or with particular matters of reference. I suspect

it can. I suspect that we may be moving from the Westminster tradition of so-called examination of the estimates into a more investigative function. I think that's entirely useful for a Legislature. I have no qualms about that.

The analysis of estimates we will always have available for us. The debating of bills we will always undertake. The Leader of the Opposition is right: There are certain initiatives which the opposition can take which are clearly not given to backbench government members. Whether or not we exploit them to the full is our problem and our decision.

But if the emphasis shifts a little from the classic debating style to an investigative performance—and by that I mean an intelligent, reasoned and judicious investigative performance, that's where I part company from much of the congressional system in the United States—I think the committee system has a great deal to be said for it.

And I think that select committees also have something to be said for them, although my own experience forces me to be dubious. But members now are rather more sophisticated; they don't get quite as easily seduced as I was seduced when I first came into this House and joined the select committee on youth, and wandered around for three years and helped to author a report which from that day to this has been consigned to some shelf somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But the member doesn't agree with the report?

Mr. Lewis: Pardon? Where are all those days? I shudder when I think back—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why did the member sign it?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): It must have had something to do with the membership of the committee. Most of them produced things that have been acted upon.

Mr. Lewis: —at the way in which the member for Kingston and Islands (Mr. Apps) stick-handled his way through three years in that committee chairmanship and worked his—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member disagreed with it.

Mr. Lewis: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member disagreed with a lot of them.

Mr. Lewis: I disagree with a lot of the report recommendations? I disagree with some of them. I regarded a lot of them as pretty self-indulgent stuff at the time. For three years we took the government off the hook in a pretty critical area; therefore, I'm inclined to view select committees with jaundiced eye. I wish they too could be strengthened in their investigative functions.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member was never of any assistance.

Mr. Lewis: Select committees don't have quite the opportunity, unless they have changed, to draw before them certain witnesses, to demand the exposure of certain documents, to provide for certain testimony; or they very rarely do!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What is the age of majority in this province?

Mr. Lewis: The age of majority?

Mr. Foulds: For the minister it should be 69.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was a natural and helpful observation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I think it spoke to the question asked.

Mr. Deans: It was also a rather silly question.

Mr. Lewis: I may also say a word, while talking of the committee structure, about the private members' bills and resolutions. I don't understand the process of downgrading that has occurred. I don't understand why it is impossible to have votes on private members' bills and resolutions. I don't know why you can't establish the precedent of saying that the government will not be bound by the vote, but that the vote is free and judges the temper of the House.

I have always felt, and continue to feel today, that the sense of involvement of private members would be much greater if they could systematically and frequently bring issues to debate and vote in the House. As it is, the private members' hour is often ludicrous and everyone knows it. We would wish it otherwise and I hope that the commission will see fit to change that in no uncertain terms.

In other words, I am hoping that the precedents tentatively established will be ex-

amined, extended and that all our committee work will be given a pretty critical appraisal.

Further, if this isn't presumptuous—I am going to say it anyway—I would like to see the commission look at a way in which the government backbenchers, at least, can participate more directly in policy formation. The commission may decide that that is not their prerogative at all, but COGP did not deal with it. It may be seen purely as a prerogative of party or cabinet.

I would like to feel that, just as in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom there is an involvement of government backbenchers—indeed, there is an involvement at the moment of Labour backbenchers—in a series of major committees in various areas; economic, social, environmental. These committees actually deal with basic policy formation prior to the introduction of bills, and give members a very important sense that they are part of the process.

As a matter of fact, they make certain members public spokesmen on certain matters. I think that, too, would be immensely useful. I don't know the workings of the Tory caucus; but I sense that most legislation is brought to caucus and approved, as it were, after the event, although there may be some amendments to the bill. To have members involved in that policy formation would surely be a useful idea.

That brings me briefly, Mr. Speaker, to the particular role of the opposition. I think the commission should look at the opposition not merely as another series of private members, but as The Opposition, in capitals, and see where we are falling down—no, where we can better use or have available to us avenues or instruments for persuading the government and effecting policy to institute social change.

I don't know whether that will mean research staff. I don't know whether that will mean full-time secretaries. I don't know whether that will mean a more important opposition role in the chairing of committees and in the taking of leadership in those committees. It seems to me that if you simply say that the opposition private members have an equal apportionment of time and money, what you are really saying is that everything is loaded in favour of the government, because the government, of course, has, in addition to that, the entire civil service.

That seems to me to make the opposition a rather subsidiary force. In fact, the opposition should be given—or it might be considered that the opposition be given—certain supports, I would think largely of a research nature, which would allow us to do the kind of job which could make an impact in areas where we do not have call on the vast apparatus of the civil service that the government clearly does.

That is a particular problem which has nothing to do with the results of an election or the numbers in the House or the adequacy of performance. It has to do with the way in which the Legislature is structured and the apparatus works. I have a feeling that this commission may take a look at that for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, I am really coming to the end of what I wanted to say. There are only two or three other points. One of the most pressing problems I sense, in the general weariness and anxiety which many members feel, is the most extraordinary case loads they carry. While case loads are often useful in debate, in the estimates in housing I hope to be able to make reference at some time to certain individual examples that have come through my own riding; and other members do the same. While it is profoundly useful in debate; it really does detract from the time which should be turned to the other part of our job.

I don't know what has happened in the last two or three years. It is absolutely staggering, the qualitative change in the constituency work of individual members. It is quite overwhelming. I presume it is merely an extension of this phenomenon that citizens feel accessibility to the members; all of which is first rate. They make demands upon us. The avenues are opening up.

I know there are members in the NDP caucus who spend earnestly 40 to 50 hours a week on case work alone. They do it with, of course, whatever secretarial help they can find. I'm being quite confident in the use of those figures. I am thinking of many of my northern colleagues who will spend an entire weekend, plus God-knows how many hours on the phone and in their service centres during the week. It is a full 40-hour week, in addition to everything they are expected to do here.

They feel kind of oppressed about it. As a matter of fact I look around the House and I often see that members are not in attendance. We go through the discussion in caucus intermittently about who is able to come to the House and if they are not where are they. And the members say, with some feeling, that they are in their offices dealing with eight or 10 or 12 emergency cases involving workmen's compensation, un-

employment insurance, housing or a social allowance that they can't let go. They simply have this enormous pressure of the case load and very little opportunity to share it, because they have absolutely no resources in their own riding association, in their own constituency.

I think that that is surely an imperative if we are revamping the role of the individual member. I know, Mr. Speaker, speaking very personally of my own service centre in my riding of Scarborough West. Every Sunday afternoon I suppose I receive a dozen to 15 cases in person, never mind the phone calls. These are usually acute cases, because people do not tend to come to their members unless the cases are acute. I really find quite oppressive the number of hours that it takes to sort it out and deal with it without adequate support—and I have a hell of lot more support staff than most individual members of the House.

I would wish there were ways, in the riding of Scarborough West as in every riding in the province, to provide some auxilliary help for the individual members, because we have had a sudden explosion.

And then Mr. Lubinsky, whom I see under the gallery, comes to see me—as I think he has come to see every single member of the House, and says: "We are establishing a citizens advisory bureau rather more formally, and we have X-thousands of calls per week.

"Many of them deal with problems not just seeking direction to individual departments, and we are going to try to find the best way to deal with these problems; but clearly they will all have to be directed at some point to the members involved, because the members are usually involved at some point along the way".

Well I agree with the opening up of avenues and channels and the inviting of citizens' questions, opinions, considerations, problems from all over the province. Again, you are saying to the members of the Legislature that their workload will necessarily expand as the government makes of this project a cause celebre; as clearly you intend to do. You will make it one of the great things in the province; and then it will become an item for some dispute and debate. I can see the writing on the wall.

I really think that the members deserve some support. I don't believe that that is a self-indulgent or self-serving plea. It has gone completely out of control for a number of people in this Legislature.

As to the media, it has been said before, and we cannot but concur, that the House should be open to all of those who sit in the gallery, without constraint. Some will be able to use it more effectively than others. The Minister of Revenue, (Mr. Grossman) for example, has a changing room in his office. He can put on and take off his makeup as his estimates arrive. Knowing the Minister of Revenue, the makeup is already on the shelf; and indeed he probably has trained his executive assistant in the application of eye shadow.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): I can put on a new face!

Mr. Lewis: I may say, Mr. Speaker, even though the use of television cameras and other electronic devices may bring the government down, it is the kind of thing which the government should hazard, because it is really quite a discriminatory provision which makes the assumption that only the linear media are capable of making value judgments. We will take our chances with it as well. That inveterate Tory in Alberta is taking his chances with it and seems to have survived. The benign presence of the Premier could not do otherwise. I hope the commission will look into that.

Finally, although it is not judicious to raise all these matters, I want to make reference—so that the commission receives some encouragement both publicly and privately—to the matter of benefits as alluded to in the resolution. I want simply to say that there are areas like travel allowance in this province, which are absolutely integral to the functioning of some of the members who live rather more distant from Toronto. They have not yet received the kind of support which they should from the government in order to service their constituencies and do their jobs.

I have heard it whispered—I dare not say from which sources—that matters of pension arrangements, and so forth, for some of the members who are a little further advanced in years than I, should be taken into consideration. I think that is real, that it is appropriate; and that in areas of that kind the commission has some very important role to play.

All in all, then, Mr. Speaker, we are saying to the commission that things have improved around this weary place, but we are still in a sorry state in certain areas. They should feel no compunction whatsoever to put everything under the microscope and to come forth with a pretty far-reaching document, without any reticence at all.

Anything we have said on behalf of private members which would apply to the New Democratic Party, we clearly feel about private members of the government party. We must recognize this as an opportunity to enhance private members' contributions; not to enforce the competitive adversary instincts of the House—they are there all the time, easily triggered—but to reinforce what individual members of this House might do.

For our part, the caucus not only will support the resolution, but we will make very formal representation to that commission—we already have documents under discussion in the caucus—and doubtless we will want to make them on an individual basis as well.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this resolution.

I am, of course, very pleased that there is a commission looking into the role of the private member, because in the five years that I've been in the House I've seen the role of private members change very much for the worse. Our opportunities to participate in the business of the House, in the brief time that I have been here, have diminished in every field.

We've been given things back in exchange, primarily money. They pay us more money now, and they give us a bigger tax-free expense allowance. The Prime Minister has been generous and has increased the allotment given to the two opposition parties for secretarial and other help. In this way we are much better off. We can phone all we want, free, all over the province.

I looked over the list of people who were using the phone calls, and some of the Conservative backbenchers have let it quite go to their heads. I notice one of the men in the last quarter spent $900 in phoning from here to Hamilton.

But money doesn't make up for the role that I think tradition meant us to play in this House. In every department, as we go through what has happened here in the last five years the backbencher has less and less role to play, and less and less influence on what goes on in the House.

You can start off with the question period. When I first came here any backbencher who wished to bring in a question could do so that day. He wrote his question out, he presented it to the Speaker by noon—it had to be a question of urgent public importance—and he would give the minister notice, so that he was prepared and we would get our question in on that day and we would get an answer that day.

Now they have what they call reformed it! They reformed us right out of it. Now if we want to get a question asked, on many, many days we must put our names on a list or hope to catch your eye, sir—and you do your best I must say—but as it has changed, questions no longer need be of urgent public importance. In fact I would hazard a guess that most of them are not of urgent public importance. In fact, most of them are neither urgent nor of public importance.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Why does the member ask them then?

Mr. Shulman: I try not to. I try to keep mine in the proper category, but I transgress on occasion too. The example set for me is not the best.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member referring to his own colleagues?

Mr. Shulman: I am referring to everyone in this House, including government backbenchers. You heard it today—the nonsensical questions that came from the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski).

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was very urgent.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, sure. Well, the minister who answered didn't think so. I am not just picking on poor Paul, who isn't aware, who really doesn't know any better. I shouldn't pick on him. This applies to everyone in the House.

The whole tenor of questions of urgent public importance has changed, and now the leaders of the two opposition parties feel that it is de rigueur, that they ask a certain number of questions and use up, of the 45 minutes that is allotted, perhaps 25 or 30 minutes; or on days when things don't go well, perhaps 42 minutes.

And I accuse the Leader of the Opposition of being responsible, because my leader went to a meeting with the Speaker of the House a relatively short time ago and suggested the leaders be restricted to three questions. Down in Ottawa they are restricted to one. He suggested they be restricted to three questions and the leader of the Liberal Party felt that this restricted him too much and so here the question—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why doesn't the member write a column about it?

Mr. Shulman: I think perhaps it is not a bad idea, but there is another forum here.

All right, the Leader of the Opposition happens to be a selfish man. We can't do anything about that, but surely there is a responsibility on government—

Mr. Deacon: That is a misleading statement.

Mr. Shulman: Well, if there is an explanation for his intransigence, I would like to hear it. There's none being offered. He felt he couldn't bind the next leader.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Most of the time the member for High Park has left before the question period is over.

Mr. Shulman: That is not so; that is not so.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is so. I have been keeping track.

Mr. Lewis: He is always here to introduce a bill.

Mr. Shulman: I am always here to bring in my bill of the day, which is after question period, so the minister is quite wrong. However, that is really not too relevant.

Mr. Deans: The minister is talking about the twice that he has been here during the question period.

Mr. Shulman: The fact remains that the question period, which is primarily meant for backbenchers, or was meant for the private members, has now become primarily a debating situation between the leaders and the cabinet ministers, and I think this is a downgrading—I am sure everyone will agree with me—it is a downgrading of the role of the backbencher. This should be reformed back to the way it was before where everyone had an equal opportunity. There are days when we can get our questions in, like today there was no problem; but there are other days when only one or two backbenchers have an opportunity to ask a question.

The other place that backbenchers—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member really want that?

Mr. Lewis: The Premier can ask me and my answer will be no.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, just as a point of information, in that I am not sure that the member for High Park is speaking for all of his colleagues.

As I understand what happened some time ago on the reformation of the rules, really part of the initiative for this came from the opposition, both the official opposition and the members of the New Democratic Party. Now if the member for High Park is saying that his caucus would support reverting to the more formal procedure, whereby written notice is given and so on, you know I think he should say this and I would like to get some indication from the entire caucus that this is the route they would like to go.

Personally, I think this would be somewhat inhibiting. I think that really the question period now, since I have been here as a member, is certainly a more stimulating period of time. I think it elicits perhaps more spontaneous answers, not always on the day that you want them, but I think it has given more life to the House than the previous procedure.

But I just want to make it clear; if it is the desire of the New Democratic Party caucus to revert, then this is something that perhaps the commission should be asked to take a look at; but I would like to have some expression.

Mr. Lewis: I think if I may say—just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker—that occasionally the member for High Park speaks on his own behalf rather than purely that of the New Democratic Party and this is one—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say that is 99 per cent of the time.

Mr. Lewis: —and this is one of those occasions.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this particular commission is supposed to be looking into the role of the backbencher—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: —and as I am apparently the first and only backbencher who cares to participate in this debate, I should have some latitude in what I wish to say; but what I was suggesting was not that we revert back—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I am just wondering if the member is speaking for more than himself—

Mr. Shulman: I'm speaking as a backbencher, I'm speaking for a number of backbenchers whom I have consulted before making my speech and not just in my own

party, although I don't wish to embarrass the minister by naming the ones in his party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am talking about the question period.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Coming to the question period, what I am suggesting, sir, is of course it is better that the questions are asked without the minister having had formal notice. What I am saying is that there should be a limit on the amount of time that is taken in the question period by the two leaders—by both leaders, but as I say the problem arises from the leader of the Liberal Party. If they must ask a number of questions, surely they should be limited in some way, be it half of the question period, be it on the number of questions—

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): What is wrong? Doesn't the member like his leader?

Mr. Shulman: —perhaps three questions at the most. Surely they shouldn't have carte blanche to ask, and ask, and ask, so that on one occasion 41 out of the 45 minutes was taken up by questions from the leaders? That, surely I think you will agree, is downgrading the role of the backbencher.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Better set up his own party!

Mr. W. Newman: That's right, then he gets his own time.

Mr. Shulman: I don't want my own party. I want a fair share for all the backbenchers, and I'm speaking for the members as well as myself—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: —and I should hope I would have their support in this.

The other area, sir, where the role of the backbencher has been downgraded just in these few years that I have been here, is on the occasions on which we may speak freely and at length and on any subject we wish, which of course is in the reply to the Speech from the Throne and the budget speech.

It had been the tradition, and it was voiced by the Speaker who preceded you, that any member of this House could speak on any subject he wished, provided he wasn't repetitious, on those two occasions. It was then with great shock, sir, that I received your reversal of that ruling earlier in this session, when you said there was no such right.

You quoted other sources in which you said the debate on the reply to the Speech from the Throne had to be finished on a certain date, and if any of us had the misfortune not to have the opportunity to get in and give our speech, this would not be possible.

I suggest this is an error. If necessary the House should sit longer hours. We didn't like sitting through the night, as happened on occasion under the previous government, but I would rather sit through the night and give everybody an opportunity to have his say than say we are going to quit on such and such a date and we are going to take the vote on such and such a date, and if you are not fortunate enough to get on your whip's list, you are not going to have the opportunity to speak. And in order to get on the whip's list you will have to guarantee you will speak for 30 minutes or 40 minutes or leave out items which are perhaps of importance to you and the people you represent.

Some of us happen to have received more requests for help than others; this is because of a number of factors. Those of us who are receiving requests for help from all over the province—and I'm sure this applies to people in all parties; I know it applies to me—have a great deal of material which we wish to bring into this House. There are only really two occasions where you may do this freely, and that is now being restricted. I think this is further downgrading of the role of the backbencher and this is something else the commission should look at.

On the private members' hour: We used to have two private members' hours, now we have one, so we have cut the role of the backbencher in half again.

Mr. W. Newman: That was an all-party agreement.

Mr. Shulman: Sure it was an all-party agreement. Everything is an all-party agreement, and each step that you take cuts the role of the backbencher. This commission is supposed to look into the role of the backbencher, and each and every step you take cuts down our role.

What difference does it make if it's an all-party agreement? What's that got to do with it? Do you want to gradually get us out of here, sitting in the back offices doing case work—looking after people's unemployment insurance problems?

Mr. W. Newman: Sometimes I think it would be a good idea.

Mr. Foulds: For the member for Ontario South it might be!

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps that might be a good idea for some of the people in this House. I would like to think it would be a bad idea for the people of this province. I would like to think that the majority of the members of this House, of all parties, are doing a service for the people of this province and are better allowed in here to do their service and to have their say, and that everyone will benefit from that. When you take step after step downgrading us you are making a serious error from the general public's point of view.

The private members' hour: All right, we have one a week now instead of two. What harm would it do if they allowed a vote to be taken? It's the second reading only. It has no legal effect. It's an indication of the way the public is thinking.

It needn't embarrass the government. You can make it mighty clear that this is a matter you're looking at. You are prepared to have a free vote. The government will not fall if a vote is passed which they, perhaps, do not approve of or are not going to bring into law. This is something that I think every backbencher will agree on. A vote should be allowed on these matters.

An hon. member: Good point!

Mr. Shulman: The private members' hour has become such a charade. I haven't even attempted to bring in one of my bills this year; I have a number on the books. In previous years, I did have some of them debated, but I realized it was a charade and a waste of time. I haven't even gone through that charade this year.

Give us some meaning! Give us the feeling we are doing something worthwhile in here, not just coming in and talking for the purpose of getting re-elected. A lot of us, most of us, perhaps all of us, really want to make a contribution and we are gradually being chipped away.

The only other place where a member of this House can participate meaningfully is in the estimates, and here again we are being cut down in our role. The problem here is that now, in an effort not to sit through the summer and to cut the number of weeks and months we sit, we now have two sets of estimates going on at the same time. That's fine; nobody quarrels with that. I think this is quite sensible.

Mr. Lawlor: No, I don't!

Mr. Shulman: Well perhaps someone does quarrel with it!

I think this has to be done, but what I do object to mightily is you are not co-operative with us when this is done.

Yesterday, for example, housing and Labour were both going on at the same time. It was impossible for me, as a private member, to be in both places at the same time. I was in here because there were certain things I wanted to hear and say on housing. I then went down to the Labour estimates and the vote I wanted to speak on briefly was passed. I approached the chairman. I said: "This vote has just passed—"

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On Wednesday!

Mr. Shulman: "—I was in the House on the housing estimates. I ask your permission to revert to this vote briefly to ask the minister a question." The chairlady took a vote of her committee and the Conservative backbenchers voted that I should not be allowed to ask this question.

This is their privilege; but once again you're chipping away at what the backbenchers can do. We can't be in two places at the same time. We have to choose now. If we have material to bring up in two department we must choose which one we are going to be in, because we can't go down to the other department and get any leeway.

Your people—and I say your people because it was a vote of the Conservative backbenchers that did this—prevented me from bringing up this very brief matter.

Actually, I'm sure the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) would agree with me—I'm sorry he's not here—it was a matter of urgency and importance to everybody in the province. Yet, for whatever reason, this wasn't allowed.

I suggest that here, in the estimates, in the private members' hour, in the Speech from the Throne, in the budget speech, in the question period, in every place where a private member can participate in this House our role has been diminished in the last five years. It's been cut. It's been cut markedly and you make up for it by giving us more money. It's a poor bargain!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member for High Park says "you," referring to the government. I would only say this: On several of the points he has made, if he feels they are, in fact, eroding the role of the backbenchers—and I think there is some debate about whether or not some of the things he says are, in fact,

relevant to that particular issue—I wish he would have the courtesy to say that this was done by all parties within this Legislature and not say the government, not say "you," because this was, in fact, the case.

Mr. Shulman: The Premier is quite right. It was done with the consent of all parties and in our ignorance, let me say, we didn't really know what was happening. When we questioned—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Then please share the ignorance, if there is ignorance to share.

Mr. Shulman: All right. There is ignorance—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would debate that there is ignorance to share.

Mr. Shulman: There is no question it was ignorance on this side when we allowed some of the changes. We didn't realize what the implications were.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member's leader doesn't agree with him.

Mr. Shulman: I think my leader does agree with me, because he went to the meeting of the leaders and attempted to have the question period reformed but could not get the support from the official opposition.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is shaking his head and saying no.

Mr. Lewis: No, I'm not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why is he shaking his head?

Mr. Shulman: He is shaking his head and saying yes.

Mr. Lewis: I was thinking of certain other problems.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we can understand that and sympathize with him.

Mr. Lewis: Right. It came to me suddenly —the changes the government makes.

Mr. Shulman: The fact remains that those changes took place; for whatever reason, we thought they were going to improve things. For whatever reason, the role of the backbenchers in all three parties has been degraded and cut down as a result, and once this change was made we couldn't reverse it.

We have now a question period in which the leaders go on at great length and we may or may not have a chance to ask a question that day. There doesn't seem to be anything the backbenchers can do about it. I know my feelings are shared by many of my colleagues with whom I've discussed this. I know this was discussed in caucus, and yet we are helpless because there is nothing we can do.

Now you have a commission to look into this and you people—and I say "you" advisedly—you as the Prime Minister and as the government have the power, while we are helpless.

Mr. Prime Minister, you are aware that these things have occurred, regardless of where the responsibility lies. And I happily take my share of the responsibility, because what I did I did through ignorance. I didn't realize what was happening and how the role was being chipped away. It has been done, and I will take all the responsibility if that'll do any good.

But you are the only one who can do something about reversing this thing and giving the backbencher a meaningful role in this House; not just acting as a middleman between his constituents and the Compensation Board, between his constituents and the various ministers, or between his constituents and the Unemployment Insurance Commission. Surely the MPP should have a more meaningful role than that—although that is important; I don't denigrate that in any way.

The role of acting as a minor league ombudsman is important. It has to be done, and I believe the MPPs should continue to do it. But we should have a role here also, and it shouldn't continue to be chipped away. You shouldn't buy us off with bigger salaries bigger expense accounts and private secretaries. You should give us back the role that we had before; if you do, everyone will profit by it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief comments I would like to make. I want to support the resolution, and I want to make a few suggestions that I think have some merit in this debate.

Quite frankly, I do believe that we should have this commission examine the real role of accountability. Last December I put a resolution on the order paper to the effect that on the second day of the session the ministry should report their functions in an accountable manner between the previous session and the start of the new one. I think that has merit, because it will also inform

the members of this House as to what the ministry and the executive council did in that interim.

I think another thing that is required here is a much larger committee room with a permanent setting to allow for proper decorum and acoustics—and it should be in this building.

Another thing that should be closely examined by this commission is the matter of research available to the backbencher, and it's my opinion, for what it's worth, that the research should not be conducted by the caucus; it should be conducted by the library of this House.

Mr. Lewis: No. As a matter of fact, no.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I think the caucuses can do their own part of the research, but generally it should be done by the library.

Mr. Lewis: Give us some help!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Why doesn't the member talk to his new leader?

Mr. Lewis: We don't waste it on political issues!

Mr. Deans: We don't get enough to waste it on anything!

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Another thing that I think should be examined by this commission is to see if there is a possibility of correcting one injustice that is done to several of the members of this House, and that is in regard to the prohibition of their participating in the Canada Pension Plan.

I think another thing that should happen is that examinations should be made to determine whether there is a need for a full-time secretary for each member here at this House.

I disagree with the leader of the official opposition's comments in regard to the proposed select committee on snowmobiles, because this has been a tremendous worry and concern to many people in this province. I think that a select committee could do a very worthwhile service in suggesting legislation and safety methods. Even looking at the coroners' reports of this province and seeing what might be done in a worthwhile way would be of service to this House and to the people of this province.

I believe another thing that should be examined by this commission is the right of petition and how it might be revised and used on behalf of and for the betterment of the people of this province.

I think another thing that should be examined by this commission is whether it is not time now to consider the matter of whether we should sit on Fridays, because I believe that Friday should be a day that we could more usefully be in our riding. Most meetings of associations, committees and different things in society today hold their meetings on Fridays. I believe that we as members could be much more serviceable in being there.

Mr. Cassidy: A withering generalization if I ever heard one.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I think another thing that should be examined by this commission is whether or not the government should be and must always be allowed to govern. If I read the remarks of the two leaders of the opposition parties today, they would take unto themselves much of this governing power. They didn't really come out and say it, but they certainly alluded to it. I do think it is the prerogative of the party elected to govern to do just that.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): And they are going to go on forever!

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that I could think of that should be examined by this commission. I do believe that it is worthwhile; it is a need in society today, and it certainly can enhance the opportunity to us as backbenchers and also be of great service to the people of this province. I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments on this commission. I think it is long overdue and I am pleased the Premier is introducing the resolution.

Certainly facilities for us, physically, have improved vastly just in the five years since I first entered the Legislature. I appreciate the fact that we now have our own offices and we have other facilities that aid us a great deal in getting our work done. It has been needed because of the increase in the workload, which has been mentioned before.

One thing I resent very much about the present system, for example of compensation to members in government, is the fact that the form in which it is given makes the public think that the members are getting $18,000 a year. A normal person hired by a businessman is paid a salary and, then can

charge his legitimate business expenses, which usually are subject to approval by a senior person in the firm. In any event, they are subject to examination. Wouldn't it be better for us really to have a set amount of compensation that is ours as a salary, and in the same way as people in ordinary commercial enterprise or other enterprise are provided for, put in our legitimate expenses for payment and have those expenses, of course, subject to examination. The hon. member for High Park has just mentioned the amount of telephone bills he has seen somebody put in for; that is something that is available for public examination, and therefore there is the accountability of that member to the people for what he has spent. I think it is important that we have this flexibility in the way we provide for our requirements.

One thing that interested me is the various ideas that have come forward as to how we should meet the needs of people in our riding, whether it should be in an office or whatever means it should be. In my particular riding, which is about the same area as Metropolitan Toronto, I also have a problem with people having to pay long distance toll charges to reach me. So I have set up people in different parts of the riding—three people in different parts of the riding—who receive a nominal amount from me and have private telephones or second telephones in their homes which they answer. This, in effect, provides people in the riding with virtually 24-hour service, seven days a week, at a very nominal cost to me. Since my office here at Queen's Park is close to the riding, I don't need to have, in my view, a special office. But in other areas, as my leader has mentioned, they do need to have a special office, and they need to have a lot more facilities than I need in my particular riding.

Surely we should provide in any plan, the flexibility to meet these varying requirements, but ensure at all times that whatever is done, there's responsibility taken by the member. He has to be accountable to the public for an examination of the expenses he involves.

I think it's a mistake for the public to get the impression we receive special treatment. In fact we do get special treatment with this $6,000 in expenses that we don't have to report or have any accountability for, even though many of us spend far more than that in our work. It's a wrong impression that we're giving to people that because we're elected or because we're politicians we are getting special deals for ourselves.

I hope the committee will look into this matter and recognize there is plenty of room to introduce procedures that are common and apply to everybody other than politicians.

My leader has mentioned the role that select committees have played and the fact that he hasn't felt they have made as much of a contribution as they might have made in the past. Perhaps this is because in the past there hasn't been enough emphasis and direction given to select committees—they've been too vague in their direction.

In both the select committees I've served on, the government leaders—in this last case, the Premier himself—gave us a target date to report and gave us in one sense, a rather narrow area of examination, but fortunately he also broadened the scope so we could actually go into the whole matter of foreign ownership and control of culture in a broader way than just examining a government report.

By setting a target date, there is a much greater sense of urgency placed upon the select committee. The select committee on taxation was given, I think, only three months to carry out its work. But it did a very thorough job—the members were quite excited about the challenge that was given them. As a result of that work they were well-informed and have been able to make a significant contribution to the discussions of tax reform whenever they've arisen in this House.

The same could be true of any select committee. It means that more than just the minister concerned and his special few advisers are informed and can debate and can bring pressure to bear for improvements in the areas that are being examined by the select committee.

Certainly we're not interested in mere joy rides. We're interested in serious investigation and examinations of problems. I don't think there's any better way that the democratic system can become increasingly effective than through greater use of select committees and examination of problems.

We get pretty upset when the only problem suggested for our examination is snowmobiling. Although it is a serious problem, as been mentioned by the member for Victoria-Haliburton, there are many other areas in which select committees could do an excellent job if resources made available to them. And far better, in my view, and far faster and far more responsibly than any royal commission.

So I hope that the committee examining this situation will look at ways of making that part of the democratic process far more important than it has been in the past.

Insofar as procedures in the House are concerned, one matter has been a cause of debate in the past. It is the fact that when we have the estimates committee sitting downstairs, we sometimes are examining legislation in the House at the same time. I think that's wrong. Regardless of what the member for High Park says about the fact of missing some portion of a debate on estimates, I don't think that's nearly as important as missing a discussion or a debate on the passing of some new legislation. I well remember last year my annoyance when, while the transportation estimates on public transit were being debated downstairs, where I was involved, the then Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs brought in for second reading, a bill on the security legislation, on which I'd had a great deal of work done and, as a result of that, I had no opportunity to participate and contribute to that debate. It's very important, even though we're trying, I think very sensibly to speed up the procedure of examination of the estimates, that we should not in any way make it difficult for the members to contribute to improving legislation.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Durham.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, my comments will be very brief, but I speak from experience as a former government whip. I feel I should perhaps add a few words, because perhaps I've as good an understanding as anyone of the needs and the problems being faced by individual members, particularly on the government side, and the frustration that they must feel, and do feel at times as to where their priorities should be set.

I must congratulate the Prime Minister on his resolution. I'm sure it will have as its objective, and certainly I hope it will result in a revitalizing of the democratic process, particularly with emphasis on the role that this Legislature itself must play in the democratic life of our society.

I think we're all aware of the very significant reduction in attendance following the question period in this House every day. It's a matter of embarrassment, I know, to the whips and it should be a matter of embarrassment to all of us. Yet I'm sure you share my views that we're forced to do it. Either we represent the needs and provide service for our respective ridings, or we sit in this House and participate or listen to debates. As has been mentioned many times this morning, the workload of the individual member is becoming increasingly great.

Mr. Lawlor: As long as it's not the King Cole Room.

Mr. Carruthers: Right!

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That dates the member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's a long time ago!

Mr. Singer: Oh, years ago!

Mr. Carruthers: The fact of the matter is that due to the pressure of the workload the member is required to make a choice, and a very difficult choice it is. Great progress has been made, as has been stated before this morning, in providing services for the members and facilities, particularly in the field of offices and secretarial help.

I can recall that when I first entered this Legislature in 1959 I had to do my work at my seat, write out a letter longhand and send it up to a small pool of secretaries to be typed and sent back down, and I mailed it myself. That day is gone and there has been great progress made in providing improved services.

At the same time, the workload has multiplied to such an extent that I feel some type of service must be provided for the individual member in his respective riding. I don't know what form this will take, but I trust that the commission will give it a great deal of consideration. It will vary, I'm sure, in different ridings, because in urban ridings many members already do provide office and clinic services for their constituents. In a large rural riding, the service would have to be of a different nature. In my own particular riding an office, perhaps in the centre of the riding, would serve a great purpose; but I believe there are other ways by which the service could be improved for the member which would be of greater advantage.

The Leader of the Opposition party, apparently, puts a great deal of emphasis on committees, and it's true that committees must play a very important role in the life of the Legislature. I have my reservations in this connection, and I would trust that the commission will give this matter a great deal of consideration.

Mr. Lawlor: What are the member's reservations?

Mr. Carruthers: I would hate to see the dignity and the responsibility of this Legislature lessened through the expansion of the committee system.

Mr. Lawlor: It is an ambulatory voice.

Mr. Carruthers: Is that right?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes.

Mr. Carruthers: We have heard the member's views; now I would like to express some views myself.

Mr. Lawlor: The member is purblind!

Mr. Carruthers: Reference has been made to the question period in the House, particularly by the member for High Park.

Mr. Singer: He has gone. Where is he?

Mr. Carruthers: Yes, he has gone.

Although I am encouraged to see more questions coming from this side of the House, there is a reason the members on this side of the House don't ask as many questions. I think it is due to the fact they pick the telephone up and in a minute's time they can get the answer from the various departments.

The only reason that opposition members ask questions, or a very large number of them—and they are not pertinent—is for political reasons. We understand that on this side of the House. We appreciate the fact that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: What game is the member engaged in? Who is he trying to kid?

Mr. Carruthers: I am engaged in providing the best service possible to my constituents.

Mr. Lewis: Well hopefully the commission will remove—

Mr. MacDonald: Did the member ever listen to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) give a report?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: Time is running out and I realize other members wish to speak on this subject. Again I wish to congratulate the Prime Minister and I look forward to very favourable results from the work of this commission.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make three points and I will make them very briefly because we are nearing the end of the morning and other people want to speak.

The first one is that one of the things that hit me very substantially when I came down to this House was how few resources the opposition has to combat the government. I hope that the commission will look at this very seriously when it is set up. My leader has already said a word or two about this.

One looks, for example, at Mr. Goyette and the people he has in the Ontario Housing Corp. who have come in to help the Minister of Revenue on one aspect alone of his estimates. When you take that right through all of the government departments and then look—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They aren't the only resources.

Mr. Foulds: The minister had better go home. He is not going to get through the estimates.

Mr. Cassidy: Send him home, yes! The fact is that we come in to estimates, we come in to debate bills and so on, literally with the assistance of a man and a boy. We come up against the government which has tremendous resources in the civil service.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right.

Mr. Cassidy: This, I think, has got to be seen as one of the most important things that the commission looks at.

Mr. Lawlor: It's amazing that we do as well as we do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They succeed in spite of themselves, is that what the member is saying?

Mr. Lawlor: I am full of self-pity this morning.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I knew he was full of something this morning.

Mr. Lawlor: Get back to your seat; you are not supposed to speak.

Mr. Cassidy: The fact that we do as well, of course, is because the government is so careless and vulnerable. All the same one would hope—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We demonstrated that not too long ago, didn't we?

Mr. Cassidy: When the government got 44 per cent of the vote, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What was the hon. member's percentage?

Mr. Cassidy: I did pretty well.

Mr. MacDonald: It was high enough to win against the Tories down there in the seat they were going to win, anyway!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will give the member my personal percentage too, if he wants that. What was the party's collective percentage?

Mr. Foulds: Considering the personal advertising the Premier had across the province!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was talking about for Peel North only.

Mr. Cassidy: The second point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did the Premier say "poor Peel North"? That is the way we think of it!

Mr. Cassidy: —about the question of assistance within the ridings. I have had personal experience with the riding office over the last seven or eight months. I think it is similar to that which a number of members have talked about in private as something they consider to be desirable.

The manager of that office is putting in a 50 to 60 hour week; he is supplemented by volunteers. When one of the volunteers took over the other day for a full day he said, "You know, this is a great job—for three people." The operation costs $9,000 or $10,000 a year and I think this is an indication—I will certainly give the commission more details—of what is needed in many of the busy urban ridings, and I would assume in many of the ridings which have rural areas as well. It is an area that is apparently well served; it is close to the federal House of Commons, and so on. And yet even there, there is the need; and the only reason that I have been able to keep my head above water is through having that kind of office.

A third point I want to make is not nearly as substantive as those first two. But it is one of those niggling things that really bothers me; and may bother other members as well. It bothers me particularly when I see that, say the member for Carleton (Mr. Handleman) is hitching a ride in one of the minister's airplanes.

Our biggest problem as members, personally, is time; the amount of time that we can devote to all of the many complex responsibilities that we have to take care of. The House, our constituency business, party business, and occasionally our families. I must confess that I find that the travel allowance and the fact that it almost compels one to take trains, to drive long distances, to make other inconvenient alternatives to taking airplanes, is something that is really niggling and really hurts one's effectiveness. I will raise that point again with the commission.

The commission should remember that the opposition has got to have resources that are more than equal on a one-to-one basis. To simply take it on a one-to-one basis and say that we are backbenchers, or private members like everybody else, and we don't have responsibilities that go beyond that; then the commission will not have done its job.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are a dozen-and-one topics that one might raise at this point, but I suppose it is more appropriate to deal directly with the commission. Therefore I am not going to take a great deal of the time of the House.

I'll just mention one by way of emphasis. It is the first point raised by my colleague who was just speaking; namely, the imbalance of resources available to the government as opposed to the opposition, or to the opposition as opposed to the government.

I won't go into details on that. I deigned to put it all down in an article that was published in the Globe. Conceivably some in the seats of authority deigned to read it.

Indeed, I was rather surprised by somebody who is pretty close to the heart of this government, and whom I don't particularly know well. But that evening I happened to be going out of this building at the same time as he was, and he made a point of saying: "Look Donald, I read your article this morning, I think it was completely fair." You could have bowled me over with the proverbial feather at that point, because quite frankly he was one whom I would have thought would regard it as being unfair.

I wondered whether I shouldn't have been a lot stronger in my case if fairness would seem to be the result from that quarter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It may have been fair, but not objective.

Mr. MacDonald: Well no; objective and fair.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought he only used the term "fair."

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I have forgotten what term. But he thought it was a wholly reasonable case that had been made. And the heading that the Globe chose to put on it was: "The Clout That The Opposition Doesn't Have Because It Hasn't Got the Resources." However, having said it, I am not going to emphasize that; let me leave it and just deal with the one point I do want to touch on.

The focus of this commission is to examine the role of the individual member—I was going to say backbenchers, but some people find that offensive—in each of the parties. I was rather intrigued in reading one sentence in Fred Schindler's book on "Responsible Government in Ontario," where he contended that in the early years the backbencher did have a very significant role.

Quite frankly I have been curious about that. I rather doubt it. Some of the ideas with regard to the relationship of the executive in the Legislature in the early days were pretty bizarre. Indeed, I was astounded when I got back to doing a little bit of study on these topics. I discovered that the government of Manitoba, for about six or eight years after it was first established, operated with virtually no reference to the Legislature; just exclusively with the Lieutenant Governor from the executive level. Something of the same kind of approach I think existed in all provinces.

However, I think that became consolidated—and let me be frank without being offensive—because of the dominant, paramount role of certain Prime Ministers in the history of the Province of Ontario. If you read, for example, the biography of Mitch Hepburn; he ran a one man show. And you don't need to go much further than—can I say it—Leslie Frost. That was another one-man show, to a considerable extent; partly for reasons and partly as an expression of the personality of the individuals. But the result was that the individual member of the House was reduced to a cipher. It was reflected, for example, in the withering away of the question period, which we have gradually rebuilt.

When I first came into this House the question period was virtually non-existent. Then we got into the stage where you had to write a question and get it through the veto powers of the Speaker and it was replied to in a prepared statement by the minister. Well, we've made some progress in that.

We've made some progress in restoring the rights to the opposition, and individual members as expressed through opposition parties, in your want of confidence motions, which are now restored to at least the number of three.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why didn't the member have the member for High Park stay and listen?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I want to get to the key point, and the member for High Park is not my major concern at the moment; it is the man who has just spoken.

My key point is this—and I will illustrate it with one example—the government is fearful to let democracy work. I want to suggest to you that it is needlessly fearful. Let me take as an example the government's almost pathological antipathy to the proposition of permitting a vote to take place on private members' bills and resolutions.

I happened to be down in Nova Scotia for good and valid reasons a few months ago, and I was fascinated to see the headlines in the Halifax papers with regard to a private member's bill that had been introduced in the House the previous week. Not only do they vote on it, but the Prime Minister took part in the debate. Three or four of his cabinet ministers took part in the debate and, believe or not, the cabinet was split. Some of the cabinet members were on one side of the motion, some of the cabinet members were on the other side of the motion.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It happens sometimes.

Mr. MacDonald: It happens rather regularly in terms of debating a private member's bills and resolutions, and they have a vote at the end. And in Manitoba, it was established under Duff Roblin, I think, as an ongoing, permanent, recognized, accepted, acknowledged part of the procedures of the House for an afternoon a week in the Manitoba Legislature and a vote is taken at the end of the debate.

I suggest to the government—and I use this as an illustration of an attitude of an unnecessary fearfulness about letting the normal democratic process operate—that it is not going to be hurt by having a vote. In fact, I have suggested before and I repeat it, that I think the private members' resolutions and bills could be a perfect kite-flying experience; the government could find out what its own people think, what the opposition thinks—and indeed what the public thinks.

In fact, the hon. Minister of Revenue, who is sitting there, played that role back in the 1950s when, as a backbencher, he brought in one or two private members' bills that were passed because he got support on the government side of the House. The next year the government adopted them, and they were brought in as government legislation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They weren't passed. They became government bills later.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. I am sorry. Did I say they were passed? You are right; they weren't passed. As a matter of fact, the only private member's resolution that I can recall —no, I am sorry, there was one that had double sponsorship on the question of discrimination or human rights or something of that nature. But I brought in a bill back in 1957 for the establishment of a revolving fund to provide loans to students. The government couldn't accept it—except that it was extraordinary! they recognized the validity for once—so they put in a phony amendment and accepted the amended motion. A year or two later Dana Porter, as the Provincial Treasurer, brought in legislation to establish the first of our student aid programmes, a revolving fund. That is the only occasion in my experience in this Legislature that a private member's motion was accepted. Were you hurt by it? Of course you weren't!

I hope that on the subject of private members' bills and resolutions, the government can be persuaded to advocate to the commission that there should be some restoration of the normal democratic procedures, so that we won't have the sense of futility when we go into this debate that it is all a bit of an idle exercise because we are not going to have a vote at the end of it anyway.

It is not completely idle, I concede; at least you get a chance for publicity. But a vote, and the prospect of a vote, might mean that the Prime Minister and a few of his cabinet might be here during the debates on private members bills and resolutions. They might even participate in the debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We read them.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Sure we do.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I hae ma' doots, if I may express it. I suspect one of that office of 78, or is it now 85, reads them and you get a one-line precis or something of that nature. Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to speak to this one point and use that as an illustration of government attitude, which I hope will change and will be reflected in the recommendations of the commission.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I will try not, Mr. Speaker, to go over well-ploughed ground this morning. There are a number of areas that I am a little interested in, and one is to seek to prevail upon the commission to test the temper of Parliament. I think the only way in which we can do so with any degree of definitiveness is to look into the backgrounds of other Parliaments, in times past and elsewhere.

I have said earlier on occasion during the first session of this new Parliament that I felt that a certain sickness or malaise pervaded the House, and I still do. What exactly one attributes it to, I am not sure. The necessity of looking into it may involve a pathological examination of the entrails to find out which way the wind blows. But, you know, Parliaments are curious institutions in this way that they tend to lose relevancy; they tend to lose the froth of life and the bloodstream, because of the very kind of creature that we have created. The terms on which we reach accord, the kind of consensus that is necessary in order for the thing to exist at all, undercuts to some considerable degree, forthrightness, honesty, all the barbs, all the amplitude that we want to get into debate. In other words, you give away a lot of points when you stand up or get yourself elected to a Parliament, with respect to the public realm of what you may or may not say, as to the role that you can play and the forthrightness with which you can act.

Mr. Foulds: A very sound point.

Mr. Lawlor: Now, I am prepared to accept that as the best possible alternative, depleted as it may be, and poor in a rational sense, over against any alternative that I can think of; on one side violence and forms of competition, the other one anarchy.

But it should be well recognized that we have built in restrictions to the roles that we can play by the very virtue or the very nature of the institution. The job of the commission ought to be to widen that out. First of all to intensify our role; secondly to ventilate this chamber, open it up to as wide a public as possible.

The first way in which that can be done is in terms of the committee system, which is broadening out; and possibly I would think that in a few years we will have two days a week completely given to that system. The space provided must be enlarged and made somewhat more commodious and possible. We are obviously neophytes in this particular area.

For the two commissions that I have sat on, I could give nothing but praise. There was intensive work done. There one learned magnificently from day to day, that is on that Smith committee, to which I think no committee could possibly compare.

Mr. MacDonald: Bob Macaulay was on it.

Mr. Lawlor: Robert was there, and Johnny White was. I won't go into it, we haven't time, but it was, for a new member coming into this House, a real educational experience, really intense. Everything else since that time, as far as I am concerned, has diminished in light of it.

The tone and quality of debate in this House is not high—that is all there is to it—not just because there are a lot of dumb ministers over there who can't understand a lot of things about human existence, but because we haven't got the resources. I mean one comes in and you sit down after a debate on estimates or on bills, etc.; and you know you should have done better, that your comments should have been more penetrating, that if you had some kind of help behind you instead of doing it all by yourself all the cursed time. Then you have such a plethora of them to stand up to; sometimes you have to debate five or 10 a day.

Proper justice cannot be given to them. I for one beg for at least one assistant kind of thing, or at least somebody to go to in the areas in which I am concerned. Our research staff is not arrogated on to judicial and legal problems in that one way. One does it by himself. You can't expect them to. They are fairly good on economics, but elsewhere there are inevitably weaknesses. They should be supplemented.

The other way to do it, apart from the committee system, is through TV. You heard what I had to say during the Throne Debate on that I won't repeat myself today. I went on for 20 minutes on that occasion. I think this place has to be opened completely, to the eye of the public and let them see what happens. It will substantially improve attendance. While it will make, I'm told, for a lot of hams, there's a lot of hams here anyhow.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the Prime Minister feel he is being excluded?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Some of them are eggs and some of them are hams. We just mix them.

Mr. MacDonald: He used to direct the little theatre in Thunder Bay so—

Mr. Lawlor: They say that when they introduced TV into one of the chambers that members of a political body who had never been heard to speak before began to be quite vocal and sing like birds!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: So much so that the good doctor tells me that they had to take the thing back out of the municipal chamber. I think even that's magnificent. After all, the public will hear what kind of chirping goes on from that kind of bird.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: It would be a Tory backbencher. I have just two things on committees. I just want to say a word about that committee that was the new venture. I attended a great many of the sessions, precisely to see how it would work; and it's fine. It will save the government enormous amounts of money in terms of public investigations. There's no question that WCB committee did that for you. If it had been sent out to the courts, etc. with a panoply of instruments, you would have had to have rented space and all this sort of thing. It would have been far in excess of the cost which it was.

There are two things wrong. You ought not to restrict counsel representing witnesses on one side to carry out their own cross-examination. It's wrong to force them to feed the questions through the committee counsel.

Secondly, all members of the committee ought not to be permitted to ask questions, and those from outside the committee, like myself sitting at another table, to engage in things. Each committee should appoint its own advocate, its own counsel, and he would do the questioning. He would take the basic advice from his caucus or from the people representing that party interest, and each

party should have its own representative conducting the debate.

It would speed the thing up enormously. You would still get to the nub of the issues with power and persuasiveness. The committee system would seem to be highly viable and functional, if these two recommendations were taken into account.

One other thing I would ask the commission to do, and the Prime Minister to consider. It seems to me that we were inadequate in debate, in my opinion. We don't get sufficient access to the internal operations of government. I don't want to get into the inner chambers, into the sanctum sanctorum. I remember, for instance, the community planning branch of the government asked us over on one occasion about three years ago. They went over their plans and told us what their guidelines and whatnot were. That was highly beneficial.

The other day I asked the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow) about this, but he hasn't yet got the jurisdiction. We talk a great deal about systems analysis and computerization and the whole thing of this programming. How many of us know very much about it? Ought you not to have these people who are competent inside the government clue us in, to give those of us who are interested the opportunity to get in layman's terms the meanings of these terms. They are increasingly important in government and crucial that is that whole area of various government departments making themselves available in the sense of saying there are areas which we wish to be clued in on and that they would make themselves available to do so.

At the present time there is a self-enclosure, a kind of fear or something. I think it is the older elements of your cabinet that feel that way. The younger men, and even some not so young, are prepared to have their staffs work with us in a closer fashion than what we have as yet experienced.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there further debate? Shall the motion carry?

Resolution concurred in.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, in announcing the business for the House next week; on Monday, we will proceed with the consideration of the estimates of the Ministry of Revenue—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): The conclusion of them.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —to be followed forthwith by the Solicitor General. On Tuesday, we will move into the legislative programme, as has been indicated. I think if my friends across the way are prepared, I won't give you any particular order. The list that was issued will be dealt with.

I haven't had an opportunity, because of my schedule this morning, but I hope to present the other parties with a supplementary list first thing Monday morning; which I will do. On Thursday of next week, we will deal with item No. 1, the conclusion of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The minister doesn't mean that!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: On Friday, we will return to the consideration of estimates. Before I move the adjournment of the House, the Prime Minister has something to say.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, it's not a very important matter at all, but it relates to the discussion about the role of the private member and one's experiences here. I think it should be pointed out that today is the 17th anniversary of the election of the member for Kent (Mr. Spence); I believe, the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton); my colleague, the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman); and also the anniversary of the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), some 17 years ago.

Mr. MacDonald: And they said I was an overnight guest when I came in.

Hon. Mr. Davis: An overnight guest, and I—

Mr. MacDonald: It was a long night.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The member brought his suitcase with him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —was going to say, the member for York South certainly has moved in rather permanently. I would just like to extend to those very distinguished members of this House, our anniversary greetings of 17 years, which they have survived.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before the House leader moves the adjourn-

ment of the House. In the supplementary list of legislative action that we anticipate taking, does he intend to tell us what bills he is going to introduce as well as those that are presently on the order table?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will do my very best, Mr. Speaker; up to the impossible, I will tell members.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn, just one question. The House Leader missed Wednesday, and I understood from the—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am glad the member brought the subject up, because I was going to skate right over it; but there will be estimates on Wednesday as well.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.03 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 9, 1972

Lead pollution levels, statement by Mr. Auld 3425

Environmental conference in Stockholm, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3425

Sale of draught beer in kegs, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3426

Queen's Printer, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3426

Strike at Dunnville plant, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 3427

Strike at Kitchener plant of Dare Foods, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3427

Queen's Printer, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3428

Removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward county, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 3428

Land assembly areas, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 3429

Increase in Gray Coach Lines' fares, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Lewis 3429

Pollution control at Barrys Bay, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Burr 3430

New Toronto airport, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deacon 3430

Purchase of U.S. goods, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Dukszta 3431

Lead pollution levels, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Ruston 3431

Private members' bills, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Shulman 3431

Regulations for farm implements at highway crossing points, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Deacon 3431

Order for new inquest, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Yakabuski 3432

Accident at transformer station, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Young 3432

Property for liquor store, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Ruston 3432

Home-made wine convictions, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Deans 3432

Wholesale gasoline prices, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Burr 3433

Speeding up of OMB decisions, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Cassidy 3433

Highway carriers' rates, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Yakabuski 3433

Safety standards for bicycles, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Cassidy 3434

Disturbance at Lakeshore psychiatric hospital, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Shulman 3435

Reorganization of Whitby hospital, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Dukszta, Mr. Lewis 3435

Ontario Hydro-Electric Advisory Council, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Good, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 3436

Kidnapping of Leigh Ann Bedard, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Shulman 3437

Criticism of Transportation Ministry, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. R. F. Nixon 3437

Tabling annual report, Civil Service Commission, Mr. MacNaughton 3437

Motion to appoint commission on private members' role, by Mr. Davis, agreed to 3438

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 3465

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2